1-1-1969

Arminianism in England, 1595-1629

Betsy Halpern Amaru
University of Massachusetts Amherst

ARMINIANISM IN ENGLAND 1595-1629

A Dissertation Presented

By

Betsy Halpern Amaru

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 1969

Major Subject History

ARMINIANISM IN ENGLAND 1595-1629

A Dissertation

By

Betsy Halpern Amaru

Approved as to style and content by:

(Chairman of Committee)

(Head of Department)

(Member)

(Member)

(Member)

September 1969
(Month) (Year)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

This study attempts to trace the history of the controversy over English Arminianism from the end of Elizabeth's reign (1595) to the dissolution of the Parliament of 1629 in the reign of Charles I.

During these years the controversy over Arminianism was transformed from an apolitical dispute over the theological character of the doctrine of predestination taught by the Church of England into a major political issue involving the authority of Parliament in regard to ecclesiastical appointments and church doctrine. The primary goal of this study is to examine the two major aspects of this transformation: (1) the development of Arminianism as the subject of theological controversy; (2) the development of Arminianism as the subject of political controversy and its role in the alienation between Charles and his Parliaments.

From the outset I have been faced with several terminological problems in regard to the label "Arminian." Unfortunately the term connotes a parental relationship between the Dutch and English theologies which did not exist. By beginning this study with the Cambridge debates over predestination in 1595-96, and by examining subsequent English involvement in the Dutch controversy over predestination theology, I hope to show that although there was some connection between the Dutch and English controversies,

the English theology was an indigenous one that preceded the full formulation of a similiar doctrine by Jacobus Arminius.

Even within the English context there is some difficulty with the term "Arminian." Several modern historians, ignoring the history of the controversy over predestination during the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras, have applied the label "Arminian" to the entire Laudian church program.[1] This equation of Arminianism with Laudianism can be traced to the Parliament of 1629 and to the Puritan pamphlets of the 1630's in which "Arminian" was used as a term of opprobrium for the Laudian Church.

As opposed to these historians, I contend that the term "Arminian" should be applied primarily to the theological reaction against the orthodox Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. As such it was a subject of theological

---

[1]Two terms have been used to refer to the Laudian program: "Anglo-Catholicism" and "Arminianism." W.K. Jordan (The Development of Religious Toleration in England 1603-1640 /Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1936/) and James Tulloch (Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century /London, 1872/) have used the label "Anglo-Catholic." But as Mark Curtis points out, this term "has overtones and special meanings which make it an anachronism when applied to developments of the seventeenth century" (Oxford and Cambridge in Transition /Oxford, 1959/, note, pp. 166-67). Curtis, along with Godfrey Davies (The Early Stuarts 1603-1660 /Oxford, 1938/) and H.R. Trevor-Roper (Archbishop Laud 1573-1645 /Hamden, Connecticut, 1962/) have preferred the label "Arminian." Trevor-Roper (p. 29) and Curtis (note, pp. 166-67) both acknowledge the overly-broad application of the term, but justify their choice on the basis of the use of the term by contemporaries of the period.

controversy and an object of monarchical concern long before the development of Laudianism. Ultimately certain aspects of Arminian theology did become a part of the Laudian effort to assert the independence of the Church of England from the Genevan Reformation, and the controversy over Arminianism subsequently became the focus of a Parliamentary attack on the Laudian Church in 1629.

It is not possible to understand the nature of the Parliamentary concern with Arminianism in Charles's reign without relating that concern to the theological disputes over Arminianism during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Consequently, although the relationship between Laudianism and Arminianism is not ignored, the major focus of this study is on Arminianism as a theology, and on the monarchical policies in regard to it.

The general foundation for the development of Arminian theology was laid by the theological orientation of the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century. From its first formulation Reformation theology was theocentric. It began and ended with the contrast between the glorious, omnipotent sovereignty of God and the depraved and impotent condition of man. Alienated from God as he was, no man could rise above his corruption; no man could turn his will from the evil toward which it naturally inclined. No ecclesiastical body could aid man in working out his salvation, for no church could bridge the chasm between the

absolute justice of God and the absolute evil of man. In such a theological system the ultimate fate of man, be it for salvation or damnation, was dependent solely upon God.

As a result a doctrine of predestination irrespective of man and based upon his complete impotence held a central position in the theology of the Reformation. Although Calvin was to become its most famous exponent, the doctrine also was taught in different degrees by Luther, Zwingli, Bullinger, and Bucer.[2]

Martin Luther's theology of predestination arose out of an overwhelming sense of man's guilt and impotence. With his cry, "Everything from God is rejected of man,"[3] Luther summarized the "protestant" dilemma -- man's inability even to actively receive God's grace. With tortured concern for his own fate as well as that of all men, Luther turned from a God of justice to a loving God who, in spite of man, would save through Christ. But the salvation would be wholly of God's doing; man's role in his own salvation could only be resignation to God's will through faith alone.

---

[2]For a thorough analysis of the predestination theology of the major reformers see Henry Buis, Historic Protestantism and Predestination (Philadelphia, 1958); J.A.W. Neander, Lectures on the History of Christian Dogmas, trans. J.E. Ryland (London, 1888); H. Bavinck, The Doctrine of God, trans. W. Hendriksen (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1951) and L. Berkhof, The History of Christian Doctrines (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1949).

[3]Martin Luther, "Lectures on Romans," (1515-16) in Werke (Weimar, 1920), LVI, 250-51.

Luther never explicitly set forth the doctrine of double predestination, but his assertions of God's omnipotence and man's impotence left no doubt that the fate of the reprobate like that of the elect was decreed by God.

> It is then essentially necessary and wholesome for Christians to know that God foreknows nothing contingently, but he foresees, purposes and does all things according to His immutable, eternal and infallible will.
>
> Who will endeavor to reform his life? I answer: Nobody! No man can! God has no time for your self-reformers, for they are hypocrites. The elect who fear God will be reformed by the Holy Spirit. The rest will perish unreformed.[4]

In Zurich Ulrich Zwingli expanded this theme of mortal impotence by establishing a theology of predestination upon a thorough-going concept of divine determinism. Nothing was "accidental," and nothing was credited to the free will of man. Adam's fall was not due to Adam, but was decreed before creation in order to manifest "the splendour of the divine righteousness."[5] Similarly, every incidence of sinfulness on the part of fallen man was instigated by the divine will. Although the source of all evil, from Adam's

---

[4]Luther, "The Enslaved Will," in Erasmus-Luther, Discourses on Free Will, ed. and trans. Ernst F. Winter (New York, 1961), pp. 106, 110.

[5]Ulrich Zwingli, Reproduction From Memory of A Sermon on the Providence of God, Dedicated To His Highness, Philip of Hesse in The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli, ed. William John Hinke (Philadelphia, 1922), II, 177.

fall to the most serious sin of fallen man, lay in God's will, no sin or evil could be imputed to God, for "the same deed which is done at the instigation and direction of God, brings honor to Him, while it is a crime and sin to man..."[6] Just as God alone regulated and ordered all things, so, completely unrestricted by man's will and His own prescience, God decreed from eternity the ultimate fate of every man. The elect would remain "chosen" for salvation though they fell "into such monstrous sins as characterize the godless and rejected;"[7] while Esau, the prototype of the reprobate, "had been rejected by the will of God before he was conceived in the womb..."[8]

The predestination theology of Zwingli's successor at Zurich, Henry Bullinger, was less harsh. He did not accept Zwingli's determinism. He avoided speaking of the predes-

---

[6] Ibid., II, 182.

[7] Ibid., II, 228.

[8] Ibid., II, 204. There is no contradiction between this doctrine and the famous passage in A Short and Clear Exposition of the Christian Faith where Zwingli includes such Old Testament and pagan figures as Adam, Noah, Joshua, Moses, Gideon, Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, Antigonus, Scipios, etc. among the elect (The Latin Works..., II, 272). The actions of these men, like those after Christ, were determined by the will of God. The emphasis is not so much on the character of those heroes as on the independence of God's election from Christ's atonement as well as from man's will and behavior. In On the Providence of God... (The Latin Works..., II, 201) Zwingli notes: "For nothing prevents God from choosing from among the heathen men to revere Him, to honor Him, and after death to be united to Him. For His election is free."

tination of Adam's fall; and he was more reticent than Zwingli about setting forth a theology of reprobation.[9] But like his predecessor, he still taught a doctrine of irrespective predestination which was set forth in the Second Helvetic Confession (1564) of which Bullinger was the chief author.

> God, from eternity, predestinated or elected freely and of his own mere grace, with no respect of man's character, the saints whome he would save in Christ.[10]

The theology of predestination taught by Martin Bucer fell between the doctrine asserted by Zwingli and the one put forth by Bullinger. For Bucer, even more than for Zwingli, predestination was a manifestation of the omnipotence and glory of God.[11] Bucer did not set forth a deterministic system comparable to that of Zwingli, but he did hold that the decrees of election and reprobation were established from eternity without respect to anything save God's will.[12]

Whereas predestination was a necessary but secondary theme in the theologies of Zwingli, Bullinger, and Bucer, it lay at the core of John Calvin's entire system. Moved

---

[9]Second Helvetic Confession (1564), Chapter VII.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Constantin Hopf (ed.), "A Letter of Martin Bucer," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943), 71.

[12]Ibid., p. 69.

more by religious logic than by the emotion of a Luther, Calvin began his systematic theology with a recognition not of the mortal dilemma, but of the fact of predestination.

> We say, then, that Scripture clearly proves this much, that God by His eternal and immutable counsel, determined once for all those whom it was His pleasure one day to admit to salvation, and those whom, on the other hand, it was His pleasure to doom to destruction. We maintain that this counsel, as regards the elect, is founded on His free mercy without any respect to human worth, while those whom He dooms to destruction are excluded from access to life by just and blameless, but at the same time incomprehensible judgement.[13]

Calvin's concept of predestination, like that of Zwingli, was that of a supralapsarian interpretation as opposed to the less stringent infralapsarian one. Supralapsarianism taught that God willed the Fall of Adam, i.e., the Fall of all, and at the same time willed also the individuals who would ultimately be saved. Accordingly, God decreed the ultimate fate of every man even before creation. The infralapsarian or sublapsarian interpretation of predestination dated the decree of election after the sin of Adam and the Fall of man. Consequently the election of grace was viewed as a remedy for an existing evil rather than as a part of God's original plan.

Involved in the distinction between supralapsarianism

---

[13]Jean Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, ed. J.T. McNeil (Philadelphia, 1960), III, xxi, 7.

and infralapsarianism is the whole question of reprobation. Following Augustine the infralapsarian view asserts only a passive reprobation. God did not actively decree certain individuals to eternal damnation, but rather He chose certain individuals out of those already damned by the original sin of Adam, leaving the others to their fate. God is directly responsible for the elect through Christ, but only indirectly involved in the sinning of those doomed to sin and damnation. On the other hand, the full sublapsarian doctrine implies that by decreeing the Fall, God actively decreed the fate of the reprobate. As a result, the divine will becomes, in a logical if not religious sense, the "author of sin."

The theological and moral implications of supralapsarianism eventually broke the unity of the Reformation response to the Catholic doctrine of works. Predictably, the humanist Philip Melancthon was the first of the reformers to defect from the doctrine of double predestination. In its place he asserted the doctrine only in its positive sense -- the predestination of the elect. The fate of the reprobate he would attribute to God's foreknowledge, but not to his decree. Under the label, synergistic predestination, this became the doctrine of the Lutheran Churches.

Melancthon was only the first to react against the decretum quidem horribile. The medievalism of theocentrism made even infralapsarianism a difficult doctrine in a

world in which man was esteemed God's most glorious creation. Those who clung to the doctrine of double predestination had to cling desperately; in an effort to save a perishing world simple reiteration of the master was replaced by efforts to "out-Calvin Calvin." Calvin's successor, Beza, went further than the master, and Beza's own followers outdid him in depicting the depravity of human nature.

But this was not the only response to the doctrine of irrespective predestination. Within the Reformed Churches there did emerge liberalizing movements, and the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination came under attack particularly where great veneration for Calvin had lessened, and/or intellectual freedom had increased.

Both conditions existed within Cambridge University, in the 1590's. And when the English Calvinists attempted to impose their theology of predestination on the doctrine of a church that theologically lay between Rome and Geneva, the setting was laid for a reaction in the form of the more liberal theology of predestination which came to be called English Arminianism.

Although I have used a chronological approach in tracing the history of this reaction against Calvinistic predestination theology, no assertion is made for historical continuity or progression. Arminianism did not have a progressive evolution from Elizabethan times to the Laudian era. In fact, many of the problems that are dealt with

here arise specifically out of the absence of such historical continuity.

At the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 James I, the theologian and Calvinist monarch, not only claimed ignorance of the predestination controversy that resulted in the Lambeth Articles, but rejected those Articles. In 1618 James played a major role in the condemnation of Dutch Arminianism at the Synod of Dort while at his own court he patronized clergy whose theological inclinations were of the Arminian persuasion. And in 1625 the same James gave royal sympathy and support to Richard Montague's attempt to assert the independence of English Church doctrine from the Calvinism of Geneva. In Charles's reign it is not the whims of an erratic monarch, but the political significance that Arminian theology assumed as one aspect of Laudianism that must be accounted for.

In closing this study with the year 1629 I am not actually working within the years when Laudian Arminianism was at its height. An examination of Arminianism in the 1630's is yet to be made, but it is too long and complex a topic to be included in this study. Before an examination of Laudianism and Arminianism in the 1630's can be undertaken, the questions of Laud's own theological Arminianism, and of the role of Arminianism in the alienation between Charles and his Parliaments need to be answered. Thus, this study is, in its way, only a preface to a study of

Arminianism in the 1630's.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to Professors Theodore Caldwell, Vincent Ilardi, and Winfred Bernhard for their scholarly advice and personal encouragement; to Professor Yochanan Wijnhoven of Smith College for his kind help with translating the Latin and Dutch material; to Mr. Martin Hubbard of the University of Massachusetts Library, the staffs of the Union Theological Library and of the Kingston Area Library for their assistance in obtaining both published and unpublished manuscripts; and to Professor Howard Quint whose personal efforts as Chairman of the History Department at the University of Massachusetts made it possible for me to continue my graduate studies. To my husband and children whose unfailing patience and love made this undertaking not only easier, but possible, I cannot begin to express my gratitude.

C H A P T E R I

ENGLISH ARMINIANISM: SETTING AND DEFINITION

The Elizabethan church settlement of the sixteenth century stands out in Reformation history as a unique effort at theological vagueness. Wherever possible determinations of a dogmatic nature were avoided; and where definition of doctrine had to be made, negative rather than positive formulations still allowed a wide liberty of religious thought. A deep and abiding fear of fanaticism made comprehension and toleration the keystones of a theologically loose framework that called for conformity on the basis of patriotism and expediency rather than on the basis of religious principle. Within this Church, pledged ultimately neither to Rome nor to Geneva, Catholic and Puritan dissent could be coped with through the far ranging possibilities of compromise and quiet accommodation.

The English Church could never qualify as a genuine Reformed Church. The English Reformation was not a religious one in origin; it was political, earthbound and theologically insensitive to the intricacies of Calvinistic theology. Until the return of the Marian exiles the entire corpus of Reformed theology had little influence on the doctrine and dogma of the English Church. The peculiar

character of the Elizabethan Reformation made room for the theological influence brought home by the exiles, and at the same time harnassed these influences so as to maintain the politically wise *via media* of the Elizabethan settlement.

So long as the threat of counter reformation at home and severe repercussions from abroad held sway over the English religious scene, this policy was sustained. But in the last years of the sixteenth century the situation began to change. The Roman threat was minimized after the defeat of the *Armada*, and the Puritans at home were drawing attention to themselves with an increasingly louder call for a closer alliance with Geneva. Despite the efforts of the Establishment to maintain the "ban" on theological dogmatisms, Anglican clergy began to redefine, and in the process, to dogmatize the foundations of the Anglican *via media*. The theme of apostolic succession as opposed to royal supremacy was rehearsed in the pulpits, and Calvinistic theology came under attack in the universities. It was within this unofficial redefinition of the 1580's and 1590's that the foundations were laid for the Laudian position and "party" of the 1630's.

Between 1590 and 1630 the potentially powerful intellectual movement that was to be the undoing of the Elizabethan settlement developed. Under Laud this movement was to make principled dogma rather than political

acceptability the basis of a new *via media*, one so close to Rome that it effected a counter reformation of its own.

The first change in the Elizabethan settlement involved the substitution of a religious dogma for a political concept as the rationale for the episcopal order of the English Church, i.e., the replacement of royal supremacy by the doctrine of episcopacy *divino jure*.[1] The original defenders of the Elizabethan *via media* made no exclusive claims for the episcopal form of church government. The Anglican arrangement was viewed as legitimate on the basis of royal supremacy, the authority of the magistrate, the godly prince. The form of ecclesiastical polity was among things theologically "indifferent," resting not on any particular Scriptural text, but on the particular choice of the monarch acting as head of the Church. In response to the Presby-

---

[1]The development of the concept of episcopacy *divino jure* has been studied by Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (Cambridge, 1956), "The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *Theology*, Occasional Papers, New Series, no. 11, 1948; and by E.T. Davies, *Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford, 1950). Neither scholar traces the development of the concept within the Laudian framework. As the titles of their works would indicate, they are mainly concerned with the sixteenth century. Both authors agree that the concept of episcopacy *divino jure* was developed in the Elizabethan era, but Sykes is the more inclined of the two to see this development as continuing into the seventeenth century. "Work begun under Elizabeth continued in the Stuart century when the Anglican defense of episcopacy became even more emphatic and confident." "...firmer deductions were drawn from the historical evidence and greater weight placed upon the authority of bishops *divino jure*." (Sykes, *Old Priest...*, p. 66).

terian Puritan claim that its form of polity alone was prescribed in Scriptures, Whitgift wrote in 1573:

> ...there is no one certain kind of government in the church which must of necessity be perpetually observed.[2]

On this basis the ministry and sacraments of the non-episcopal Reformed churches could be acknowledged as valid.

Eventually, in response to the intensification of the exclusive Puritan claim, the justification of episcopacy by royal supremacy came to be buttressed by an appeal to history and religious tradition. In the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Hooker stressed the importance of circumstance in determining the form of polity.[3] Episcopacy was the rule by church tradition, but as no exclusive claim was made for it by Scriptures, in cases of necessity it might be dispensed with. For Hooker the Church of England was fortunate in having had a godly king to prescribe the traditional polity in its Reformation; yet the church polity of less fortunate kingdoms was not invalid nor unacceptable.[4]

---

[2]Quoted in V.J.K. Brook, Whitgift and the English Church (London, 1957), pp. 45-46.

[3]Richard Hooker, The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, With An Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton, ed. John Keble (Oxford, 1858), III, 231-32.

[4]See also Hooker, III, pp. 163-64, where Hooker argues that the episcopal form is based on custom "rather than the truth of any ordinance of the Lord's..." That custom began with the apostles, and under ordinary circumstances should be maintained. But precisely because episcopacy is based on custom, and not on God's command, it can be altered.

By setting the argument for episcopacy within an historical context Hooker did lay the groundwork for the first defense of episcopacy based on apostolic authority - Richard Bancroft's sermon at Paul's Cross in February of 1589. According to Bancroft, although the Scriptures contained no prescription for church polity, "bishops have had this authority...ever since St. Mark's time." There had been no "church planted ever since the apostles' time, but there the bishops had authority over the rest of the ministry." "The church of God ever since the apostles' time hath distributed the ecclesiastical ministry principally into these three parts, bishops, priests and deacons."[5] By emphasizing that every true church could trace its polity back to the apostolic example, Bancroft made episcopacy a matter of religious necessity rather than of political choice. It was but a small step to the Laudian dogma of the jus divinum of episcopacy that would exclude and invalidate the tetarchical order of the Calvinistically inclined churches. Moreover Bancroft's theological apologetic was immediately recognized by members of the Establishment as being incompatible with Elizabethan royal supremacy. Sir Frances Knollys pointed out that

> Her Majesty is not supreme Governor over the clergy if so be, that our said

---

[5]Richard Bancroft, A Sermon Preached at Paules Cross the 9 of Februarie...1588 (London, 1588), pp. 69,99.

> Bishops be not under-governors to her Majesty but superior Governors by a higher claim, than directly from her Majesty.[6]

During the reign of James I no effort was made either to reconcile or to confront the two conflicting bases for episcopacy. In his Royal Proclamation of October 24, 1603, James supported the episcopal form with the equivocal words that it was "agreeable to God's word and near to the condition of the primitive church." The same phrasing was used in the Canons of 1604. As will be seen, James's whole role in the development of the new *via media* was an anomalous one. His appointment of Richard Bancroft is offset by the appointment of the Calvinist George Abbot as successor to Bancroft at Canterbury; his Calvinism in theology offset his hatred of the Puritans. With Laud, however, there is nothing equivocal. When he defended episcopacy it was purely on the grounds of apostolic succession and divine right.

> Bishops might be regulated and limited by human laws in those things which are but incidents to their calling; but their calling, as far as it is *divino jure*, by divine right, cannot be taken away, this is the doctrine of the Church of England.[7]

---

[6]John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation Under Elizabeth* (Oxford, 1824), IV, 8.

[7]William Laud, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud, D.D. Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury* ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology"; Oxford, 1847-60), IV, 310-11.

And in testifying to the orthodoxy of Richard Montagu in 1625, Laud gave his support to one whose principle, "non est sacerdotum nisi in ecclesia, non est ecclesia, sine sacerdotio," unchurched at least in theory all the Reformed bodies on the Continent.

One of the most serious repercussions of the acceptance of a dogmatic rather than political basis for church polity was the change in church-state relations which followed logically from it.[8] Under the Elizabethan Erastian policy the church was very much the servant of the state. The bishops as servants of royal supremacy were the administrators of the Crown's authority in ecclesiastical matters,

---

[8]The change in the church-state relationship from Elizabethan to Stuart times has not been the subject of any major work. To some extent this may be due to the fact that such a change was never acknowledged by the Stuart Establishment. J.E. Neale's The Elizabethan House of Commons (London, 1949) makes reference to the relationship that Elizabeth had with her clergy. J.V.P. Thompson (Supreme Governor: A Study of Elizabethan Ecclesiastical Polity and Circumstance /London, 1940/) and Philip Hughes (The Reformation in England: "True Religion Now Established" /London, 1951-54/) give much attention to the Elizabethan situation in regard to church and state. In these works there is some effort to make a connection between the Elizabethan and Stuart periods, but in both cases it is a very minor point in the work. H.R. Trevor-Roper's study of Laud (Archbishop Laud 1573-1645 (London, 1940) is the sharpest analysis of the unique policy established during his archbishopric. But comparisons with the Elizabethan period therein are generalized, highly qualified, and infrequent. John Dykstra Eusden's Puritans, Lawyers and Politics (New Haven, 1958), although centered on an entirely different topic, sheds some light on the church-state issue which divided Puritan and Anglican. This is also true, but to a lesser extent of John New's Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition (Stanford, 1964).

the scope of which Elizabethan statesmanship kept rather narrow. Under such a system political and religious obedience were one. The change in the rationale for episcopacy in effect separated church and state, and broke the unity of the Elizabethan response to dissent. No longer could religious dissent be equated by definition with political disobedience and political treason. Equally as important, no longer could the authority of the bishops be based on the authority of the monarch.

Despite its assertions of independence the Anglican Church could neither propagate its doctrine nor offset the Puritan dissent without the support of the state. On the other hand, the monarch's effort to direct ecclesiastical affairs by assertion of royal prerogative was vulnerable to attack on the claim that an authority secular and earthly by its own admission could not make immutable law for the Church. James I faced this dilemma almost immediately with Parliamentary reaction to the Canons of 1604. With the Canons of 1606 the "Laudian" solution was already hinted at. In these canons Convocation attempted to buttress the king's claim by pointing to the Old Testament emphasis on the divine charge to kings and secular rulers to direct ecclesiastical affairs. It was only a short step to the partnership of church and state set up under Charles and Laud. The Laudian reunion of church and state was by no means a return to the royal supremacy of Elizabethan days; in fact

it most resembled a return to the Franco-Papal alliance of the eighth century. The state lent the church its authority and administrative power to enforce ecclesiastical decisions. In exchange the state received the church's blessings and support for a mystical doctrine of divine right that gave religious sanction to an unbridled political absolutism.

The general effect of these two notions - divine right theory founded upon Old Testament precedents and episcopacy grounded on divino jure - was to create a deadlock of dogma with the Puritans which appeals to reason, welfare of state, or religious truth could not break.

The third identifying feature of Laudianism was its inclination toward, and aping of Romanism.[9] The theme of apostolic succession was only the beginning of the Laudian identification with the great era of patristic Catholicism. The Protestant ideal of the simplicity of the early Church was rejected in favor of the image of the dogmatically

---

[9]There has been no comparative or developmental study of the Elizabethan and Stuart periods in respect to this particular aspect of Laudianism. Godfrey Davies has discussed the Laud-Puritan conflict over ritual and ceremony in "Arminian versus Puritan in England, ca. 1620-1640," Huntingdon Library Bulletin, no. 5 (April, 1934), pp. 157-179; "English Political Sermons 1603-1640," Huntingdon Library Quarterly, III, no. 1 (October, 1939), 1-22. Much of the same information is also found in that author's The Early Stuarts, 1603-1660 (Oxford, 1938). The Laudian identification with patristic Catholicism is also discussed briefly in James Tulloch, Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century, I (London, 1872).

sophisticated Catholic church of the fourth and fifth centuries. With a special devotion to ritual and ceremony, an exaltation of the position of the priest, and an enhancing of the power of the bishops, Laudianism announced the catholic rather than protesting character of the Church of England.

However, Laudianism was more than a rejection of the outward forms of the continental Reformation. It is into this general framework that the reaction against Calvinistic predestination theology fits as the fourth feature of the Laudian program. More than any other particular facet of Laudianism, it came to symbolize the Laudian "return" to Rome and popery.

Under Elizabeth the official doctrine of predestination had much the same character as the rest of the Elizabethan settlement - a very real via media between the Church of Rome and the Church of Geneva. Generally following the example of its Protestant predecessors, the Elizabethan position on predestination had two major characteristics which were reflected in the formularies, works of official churchmen, and in the confessions of the period:[10] (1) a general disinterest in, or disinclination to get involved in,

---

[10]Predestination theology from the reign of Henry VIII to the middle of Elizabeth's reign has been studied by O.T. Hargrave, "The Doctrine of Predestination in the English Reformation" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966).

the question of predestination; (2) where views were expressed, a moderate Augustinian or Melancthonian theory rather than the full Calvinistic doctrine was set forth. This moderate formulation of the doctrine of predestination contained nothing that was contrary to the Calvinistic doctrine, but left unsaid much that was essential to it. The most obvious of such omissions was a specific reference to the decree of reprobation. The emphasis was put on the decree of election; reprobation was presented as due to man's own sinfulness, rather than as the direct result of an absolute divine decree.

The six Articles of 1539 had nothing to say on predestination, and the King's Book of 1543 did so only indirectly, noting man's impotence to do anything pleasing to God without His grace, yet asserting man's free will to accept or reject, to persevere in or fall from, that grace. Edwardians had even less to say than Henricans on the question of predestination. The Book of Common Prayer (1552) taught the doctrine of original sin, but never dealt directly with predestination. Elizabeth's first prayer books repeated the Edwardian book of 1552 on predestination. And the new homilies in the 1563 Book of Homilies were non-theological in nature, deliberately avoiding all doctrinal controversy including predestination.

Elizabeth's archbishops at Canterbury also avoided dealing with the predestination doctrine. Matthew Parker's

single reference to it was his rebuke of a certain minister for touching upon the controversial subject in a sermon.[11] John Jewel's references to predestination were few and far between. In his Exposition upon the Two Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians (1583), he noted that God had selected a few whose calling was "sure for ever" and who "shall not fall from grace."[12] Aside from his participation in the Cambridge controversies of the 1590's, John Whitgift's involvement with the question was limited to his Defense of the Answer to the Admonition Against the Reply of Thomas Cartwright (1574) in which he affirmed the certain destiny of the elect and the reprobate.[13] Lesser churchmen such as John Foxe and Thomas Rogers were more involved in the predestination question, but even in their works the moderate theory was expressed by the absence of the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute reprobation.[14]

But it was in the Thirty-nine Articles of Elizabeth as in the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI that the moderate

---

[11]John Oliver Willyams Haweis, Sketches of the Reformation and Elizabethan Age, Taken From the Contemporary Pulpuit (London, 1844), p. 95.

[12]John Jewel, The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge, 1845-50), II, 821, 933.

[13]John Whitgift, The Works of John Whitgift, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Dean of Lincoln, etc., Afterwards Successively Bishop of Worcester and Archbishop of Canterbury, ed. John Ayre (Cambridge, 1851-52), III, 143.

[14]Hargrave, pp. 170-71.

theory of predestination was most fully presented.[15]

Following the Edwardian example, Article IX ("Of Original or Birth Sin") of the Thirty-nine Articles fell far short of the Calvinist idea of the total depravity and corruption of man's nature. It described man as "very far gone from original righteousness," and as deserving of "God's wrath and damnation." The article thus upheld the Calvinist notion of the corruption of man, but did not go far as the Calvinists in describing man as in fact receiving God's wrath and damnation. Along the same line, the article stated that baptism did not remove all sin (as in the sense of Trent), but on the other hand, the concupiscence and lust that remained after baptism were not described as "truly and properly sin" (as in the Calvinist sense).[16]

---

[15]Much effort has been put forth to characterize these confessions or specific articles in them as Calvinistic. Benjamin Warfield ("Predestination in the Reformed Confessions," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, XII (1901), 66) and E.J. Bicknell (A Theological Introduction to the Thirty Nine Articles (London, 1944), p. 193) have pointed to an overwhelming Calvinistic influence on the Articles. Pointing to the interpretation of Thomas Rogers, Philip Schaff (Bibliotheca Symbolica Ecclesiae Universalis: The Creeds of Christendom With a History and Critical Notes (4th ed., New York, 1919), I, 633) saw the predestination articles as particularly understandable "in an Augustinian or moderately Calvinistic sense." The more recent scholarship, on the other hand, has seriously damaged this interpretation. H.C. Porter (Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge (New York, 1959), p. 340), Brook (p. 159), and Hargrave (p. 86) all point to the absence of any doctrine of reprobation in the Articles, and consequently refute the characterization of them as Calvinistic.

[16]The reference here is to the phrase "concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin."

Despite its title, Article X ("Of Free Will") neither affirmed nor denied free will. It asserted the inability of the human will to do anything acceptable to God without His grace, but it did so in a language that avoided the extremes of Luther's enslaved will and of Calvin's irresistible grace. Specifically, the article stated the need for (1) preventing grace to make man capable of choosing the good - "that we may have a good will," and (2) cooperating grace to assist man once he was capable of choosing good - "and working with us, when we have that good will." The phrase "working with us" can (but need not) be interpreted as allowing room for free will.[17]

The sixteenth article ("Of Sin After Baptism") applied an equally moderate tone to the notion of indefectible grace. "We may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God, we may arise again and amend our lives." Again the Calvinistic tenet, i.e., that the elect could neither temporarily nor finally lose grace, is neither denied nor asserted. "We may" (not must) "arise again...."

The article dealing directly with predestination (XVII "Of Predestination and Election") added little to qualify or specify the doctrine as presented in the preceding

---

[17]The tenth article was well within the general spirit of the article on grace in the Forty-two Articles that affirmed God's grace with the qualification "yet nevertheless he enforceth not the will." This article was omitted in the Elizabethan formulation.

articles. It merely set forth "a positive doctrine of election that is defined and asserted."[18]

> Predestination of life, is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid), He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of His only begotten son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.
>
> As the godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the dangerous downfall, whereby the drvil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

---

[18] Hargrave, p. 85.

> Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.

For the purpose of future chapters of this study, the most important points to be noted here are: (1) the absence of any doctrine of reprobation in the article; (2) the statement that God's decrees are unknown to man ("He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us..."); (3) the closing phrases of the article warning that "we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Scriptures," i.e., as applying to all men. The implication that grace was universal was repeated in Article XXXI ("Of the One Oblation of Christ Finished Upon the Cross") with the phrase "The offering of Christ...for all the sins of the world."[19]

Even during the Elizabethan period the moderate view of predestination did not remain unchallenged. With the return of the Marian exiles, and the rise of the Puritan party, the moderates were faced with a formidable challenge. At the same time that the non-commital middle gave Elizabethan doctrine a wide range of acceptability, it laid open the way to great theological controversy. Although the Articles were not Calvinistic, they did not exclude Calvin-

---

[19] Underlining mine.

istic interpretation. They stated just enough to make the Calvinists call them their own. On the other hand, they left just enough unsaid to make those Englishmen opposed to Calvinistic predestination feel assured of the orthodoxy of their attack on this Calvinistic interpretation of the Articles.

By the 1590's the Puritans were making the same type of exclusive claim for their theory of predestination as they had made for the presbyterian church form in the 1580's. At least, the claim for predestination insisted upon a Calvinistic interpretation of the Articles as they stood. At most, it called for additions to the Articles that would leave no doubt as to their Calvinistic nature. During most of Elizabeth's reign the various Puritan claims had been held in check by the long tradition of moderation in theological issues.[20] But on the predestination issue the Puritan challenge evoked the response, not only of men committed to the moderate position, but also of those who held an anti-Calvinistic interpretation.

It was this challenge and response that formed the basis of the Cambridge controversies in the 1580's. By the early 1600's a number of influential English churchmen held either privately or publicly the anti-Calvinist theology of

---

[20]Brook and P.M. Dawley (John Whitgift and the English Reformation /New York, 1954/) have discussed this aspect of Elizabethan policy in general, and John Whitgift's role in particular.

predestination that in England came to be called Arminianism. And by the 1620's the response to the predestination question (as with the other aspects of Laudianism) became not simply a means of defense against Puritan and Calvinist dogmatisms, but rather a dogmatic assertion of the catholic character of the English Church.

The term Arminian cannot be applied historically to the anti-Calvinist position expressed during the Cambridge controversies. But the similarities between the predestination doctrine of the Cambridge protagonists and that of the Laudians raise the question as to whether English Arminianism, despite its Dutch label, was indigenous in character. On the other hand, no effort is made in this study to deny a relationship between the Arminianism of England and the Dutch system from which it got its name. In order to deal with both of these questions in later chapters (i.e., the indigenous character of the English movement and the relationship between England and the Dutch movement), it is necessary to review here something of the Dutch reaction against Calvinist theology.[21]

---

[21]The best treatments in English of the Dutch Arminian controversy are all heavily biased. John L. Motley's The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland, With a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of the Thirty Years War (New York, 1874) and Gerhard Brandt's Historie der Reformatie, trans. Chamberlayne (London, 1720-23) are the most comprehensive in spite of the authors' heavy biases in favor of the Arminians. Useful, but not as readable as the above is Thomas Scott, ed., The Articles of the Synod of Dort and its Rejection of Errors: with the

The Dutch professor of theology, Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609), studied with Beza at Geneva before he was ordained and called to the ministry at Amsterdam in 1587. Almost immediately upon beginning this ministry he was called upon to defend Beza's views on predestination against the attacks of a layman named Koornhert. In his preparatory studies for this defense Arminius himself was led to a position on election and predestination that differed little from that of Koornhert. He made no loud protestations of his dissent from the orthodox views, but changes in his exposition of Romans was noticed, and suspicion of his orthodoxy aroused. Although repeatedly attacked in the presbytery of Amsterdam, Arminius did not openly break with Geneva until 1596, and then only in his correspondence with a Francis Junius, professor of theology at Leiden. The "problem of Arminius" remained isolated to Amsterdam until 1602 when Arminius was nominated and appointed to a position in theology at Leiden University. During his stay there until his death in 1609 he repeatedly conflicted with Francis Gomarus, an orthodox professor of New Testament.

History of Events Which Made Way for that Synod (Utica, 1831). This history was officially authorized by the States-General and the Synod of Dort. Consequently its bias is in the opposite direction from that of Brandt and Motley. The least biased treatment in English is A.W. Harrison, The Beginnings of Arminianism (London, 1926). Harrison's chapters on the Dutch in his later work, Arminianism (London, 1937) are, at best, poorly compressed versions of the earlier work.

The echoes of the controversy between the two scholars resounded throughout the Netherlands; sides were drawn up and parties formed. In the process the predestination issue became entangled in other issues: with the debate over the revision of the Heidelberg Catechism and Belgic Confession, with the political competition between John of Oldenbarnevelt, Advocate of Holland, and Prince Maurice, Stadtholder of Holland and Zeeland, with the centralization-decentralization struggle among the states, and finally with the church-state struggle over civil participation in and direction of ecclesiastical affairs.

At Arminius' death the leadership of his party fell to James Uytenbogaert, at the time court chaplain to the widow of William I. In 1610 Uytenbogaert privately called the Arminian sympathizers together at Gouda. From the Gouda meeting came the formal program of the Arminian group known as the Grand Remonstrance. Supporters of this program became known as Remonstrants, and their opponents as Contra-Remonstrants.

Composed by Uytenbogaert, the Remonstrance was a rejection of supralapsarian and sublapsarian interpretations of predestination, of the orthodox Reformed concept of the role of Christ, the doctrines of irresistible grace and the perseverance of the saints or believers. In all five assertions of the Remonstrance Uytenbogaert followed closely the teachings of his predecessor.

In opposition to supralapsarianism Arminius asserted (1) the ability of man to somehow effect the salvation or damnation of his own soul, and (2) the foreknowledge rather than naked will or pleasure of God as the basis for both the decree of election and of reprobation. Like Calvin and Beza, Arminius dated God's decree from eternity; but whereas the former described the decree as the free election of some and the reprobation of others, for Arminius the decree was to "receive into favor those who repent and believe,... but to leave in sin, and under wrath, all impenitent persons and unbelievers...."[22] Arminius did not deny the Fall of man or his subsequent absolute depravity; he did deny any causal relationship between the Fall and the decrees of predestination.[23] To Arminius the assertion of this relationship robbed the sacrifice of Christ of any real meaning by ultimately assuming that Christ did nothing to change man's basic condition. In Arminius's own theological system the sacrifice of Christ became the meritorious cause of predestination, for it was through Christ that man regained his free will. Christ's effect was two-fold: he removed the stigma of original sin and the consequent bondage of the will; and he offered the gifts of grace and salvation to all.

---

[22]James Arminius, The Works of James Arminius, D.D., Formerly Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden, trans. J. Nichols & W.R. Bagnall (Auburn & Buffalo, 1853), I, 247.

[23]Ibid., II, 484-85.

Man's will was no longer necessitated toward evil. Delivered from original sin he was capable of accepting the means Christ provided for salvation.

Arminianism attacked supralapsarianism not only in its interpretation of the sacrifice of Christ, but even more directly in its characterization of the Divine.

The human religious need to characterize or describe the Divine in some way has, of linguistic necessity, resulted in anthropomorphisms. The most sublime adjective in man's vocabulary is still within the human experience and consequently conceptually limited. At best, such terms as "omnipotence" and "absolute" when taken to the n^{th} power or degree are conceptual efforts to go beyond the limits of human experience. But seldom in history has man been willing to limit himself to such attributes as omnipotency and absolutism. Consequently, anthropomorphic adjectives such as "loving," "good," "just," "merciful," have been used with one of two qualifications: (1) God's "love," "goodness," "justice," etc. are to be understood as the ultimate plus of man's "love," "goodness," "justice," etc. (Anselm's ontological proof presents one example of this usage.) The important point is that God fulfills in the most perfect way all the human conditions for the particular attribute. (2) Alternatively, one may avoid the whole dilemma by ascribing human attributes to God, but always with the qualification that when applied to God, the attribute is no

longer humanly explicable, e.g., "God's justice is His own; we (man) cannot understand it."

The orthodox Calvinist by using the second alternative was able to construct a doctrine of predestination around the omnipotence of God without concerning himself with the moral human questions of the justice or equity of such a doctrine. The Arminian did not deny the omnipotence of God, but felt morally bound to attribute to God a justice that fulfilled at least the conditions of mortal justice. For Arminius justice demanded that God's "one decree seem(s) to require the supposition of another...as the decree concerning the creation of a rational creature and the decree concerning the salvation or damnation on the condition of obedience or disobedience."[24] Justice forbade that permission for the fall of Adam be the means of executing the decree of election or of reprobation.[25] Likewise the only just basis for the decree of predestination from eternity was the foreknowledge of God. Unlike Melancthon, Arminius did not "solve" the moral problem which predestination presented by limiting the doctrine to the decree of election. Election and reprobation were both based upon God's foreknowledge of each man's decision to accept or to reject the grace offered through Christ.

---

[24] Ibid., II, 482.

[25] Ibid., II, 484-85.

Summarizing Arminius's rejection of supralapsarianism the first assertion of the Remonstrance stated:

> That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation on those whom he foresaw would persevere unto the end in their faith in Christ Jesus; and to inflict everlasting punishments on those who should continue in their unbelief, and resist unto the end, his divine succours.[26]

The second article was a negation of the less severe doctrine of sublapsarianism.

> That Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of mankind in general, and of every individual in particular; that however none but those who believe in him can be partakers of their divine benefit.

Where the rejected doctrine would claim only a limited salvation through Christ (i.e., for the elect), Arminians or Remonstrants asserted that the world for which the Saviour died was the whole body of mankind - elect and reprobate. Moreover, the immediate effect of Christ's death was not salvation, but salvability in the potential removal of the taint of original sin from all men.

Although he conditioned predestination by God's foreknowledge, Arminius never detracted from God's omnipotence. Although he admitted man's freedom to accept or reject God's

---

[26]Remonstrance articles are quoted from Brandt, II, 74-5. According to Harrison (The Beginnings..., p. 150) the Remonstrance is given verbatim in Baudart, Memoryen, I, 26-8. See also Schaff, III, 545-49.

grace, he never strayed from the basic Reformation idea that alone, man could not achieve salvation.

> When he is made a partaker of this regeneration or renovation, I consider that, since he is delivered from sin, he is capable of thinking, willing, and doing that which is good, but yet not without the continued aids of Divine Grace.[27]

It was not man's dependence but his absolute impotence that Arminius denied. Where the Calvinists made grace through Christ necessarily unavailable to the predetermined reprobate and irresistible to the predetermined elect, the Arminians[28] liberated the acceptance and rejection of Christ from the necessity of predestination and set them within human capacity. The sacrifice of Christ made it possible for all men to do good insofar as they accepted and maintained faith, thus receiving the aids of God's grace. At the same time in freeing the human will from bondage, the sacrifice of Christ made it possible for man to resist and reject God's grace.[29] Arminius' doctrine of predestination attempted to affirm both God's omnipotence and man's freedom.

---

[27]Arminius, I, 252-53.

[28]Although for the sake of clarity and brevity I make the contrast between "Calvinist" and "Arminian," it should be noted that the Dutch Arminians were also Calvinists. The difference between the two theological schools was in degree of orthodoxy. In England, on the other hand, the Arminians tended to be anti-Calvinists in that they were responding to the Puritan effort to "Calvinize" the theology of the Church of England.

[29]Arminius, I, 253.

The atonement of Christ did not replace one form of bondage with another; it did free man from necessarily doing evil, but did not necessarily bind him to doing good. Expressed in terms of the third and fourth articles of the Remonstrance,

> That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free-will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking or doing any good thing; and that therefore it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be regenerated and renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ.
>
> That this divine grace, or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorders of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection every thing that can be called good in man; and that, consequently, all good works, without exception, are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace; that nevertheless this grace does not force the man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.

The fifth and final article of the Remonstrance dealt with the problem of the perseverance of saints, i.e., whether a recipient of God's grace could fall from his faith either temporarily or finally, thus forfeiting his salvation. Although later Arminians were to negate the necessary perseverance of believers as strongly as Calvin's disciples affirmed it, Arminius as well as the original

fifth article of the Remonstrance left the issue undecided.

> Though I here openly and ingenuously affirm I never taught that a true believer can either totally or finally fall away from the faith, and perish; yet I will not conceal, that there are passages of Scripture which seem to me to wear this aspect; ... On the other hand, certain passages are produced for the contrary doctrine (of unconditional perseverance) which are worthy of much consideration.[30]

For Arminius the issue of perseverance was merely a Scriptural one. Since God's decree was not simply an expression of His absolute will, but rather arose out of His foreknowledge of man's ultimate choices, the question of perseverance did not affect predestination or threaten the omnipotence of God. The issue gained in importance for the later Arminians because of its great relevance to the Calvinist theory of predestination. For the Calvinist any denial of perseverance became a threat to their whole scheme of predestination. The specificity and absoluteness of God's decree made it impossible for man to do or be other than what the decree had ordained. More than just a question of God determining or knowing man's ultimate destiny, predestination involved God setting the will of man into a particular groove out of which it could not turn.[31]

---

[30] Ibid., I, 254.

[31] On the issue of total and final perseverance there are various positions taken by the Calvinists: (1) The justified never sin and never fall from grace. (2) The

To assert even a temporary straying from this pattern would deny the bondage of the will. To assert that God's grace could finally or totally be lost would deny the omnipotence of God. It was this immediate relationship between perseverance and the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination that made the question of perseverance a lively issue in the Cambridge controversy in the 1590's.

The Arminian theory of predestination shared with Pelagianism and Socinianism a certain sympathy for the dignity of man, and a certain repulsion from any scheme that would make man no more than a puppet. But the relationship between Arminianism and the other two doctrines goes no further than that sympathy. Though Arminius, his Dutch disciples, and those who subscribed to what came to be called English Arminianism were frequently accused of Pelagianism, Arminianism disavowed Pelagianism as much as the opposite extreme - supralapsarianism. Arminianism would no more have man completely free than it would have him completely bound. Where Pelagius denied original sin through Adam, Arminius reaffirmed it. Where Pelagianism made man's will absolutely free and God's grace dispensable, Arminianism made man's will conditionally free and God's grace indispensable.

---

justified may sin grievously, but the seed of grace planted by God is never destroyed. (3) The justified may sin grievously, but their sins are not imputed to them by God because they are the elect.

Equally untenable is the identification of Arminianism and Socinianism. Arminius not only never adopted a Socinian view, but even wrote a refutation of Socinius' treatise, On the Savior.[32] Socinius went much further than Arminius in his rejections of predestination and his assertion of free will. Denying the entire sacrificial, atonement character of Christ's work, Socinianism emphasized the human, exemplary role of Christ. There was no need for a vicarious atonement, for man never had lost his moral capacities; and as man's will was absolutely free, a doctrine of predestination was equally unnecessary. For Arminius on the other hand man's limited freedom was gotten vicariously through the atonement of Christ; man's capacity to know and do good was never from his own inner self, but from God's grace.

Logic did not demand that Arminius retain predestination in his scheme, but he was too conservative, too Calvinistic one might say, to throw overboard the ultimate expression of God's omnipotence. Seldom was Arminius seen as such; seldom was the doctrine which received his name appreciated as an effort to preserve the basic character of Calvinism. Instead, Arminianism was viewed as revolutionary heresy; it was identified with Pelagianism and Socinianism because it called for some liberalization of Calvinistic

---

[32]Harrison, The Beginnings..., p. 81.

theology. To the sixteenth and early seventeenth century Calvinist any change whatsoever in the direction of liberalization of the master's teaching was by definition heretical, and not to be differentiated from the older liberalizing heresies of Pelagianism and Socinianism.

Dutch Arminianism, however, was more than an "heretical" theory of predestination. As has been noted, the predestination controversy in the Netherlands became entangled with many political side issues, most particularly with the problem of church and state.[33] As a result, the term Arminian became identified not only with a certain theological reaction against Calvinism, but also with a particular view of church-state relations. Much of the controversy over Arminius centered on the issue of what role the state should play in resolving questions of religious doctrine, particularly when such questions involved disorder that threatened the religious welfare of the state, as was true in the case of the Netherlands.

In Arminius's day the Dutch church claimed the right to resolve all questions of religious doctrine independently of the state. As early as 1606 Arminius, in an oration on religious dissension, questioned this right. Proposing that a national synod of lay and ecclesiastical membership, summoned and supervised by the civil powers, would be the

---

[33] See D. Nobb, Theocracy and Toleration: A Study of the Disputes in Dutch Calvinism from 1600 to 1650 (Cambridge, 1938).

best remedy for religious dissension, he argued:

> Such an arrangement is required by the public weal, which is never committed with greater safety to the custody of anyone than to his whose private advantage is entirely unconnected with the issue,[34]

This synod would limit its discussion to things pertaining to religion. In particular it would attempt to resolve dissension in matters of faith and doctrine by (1) considering the truth of the doctrines in controversy and (2) ascertaining "the degree of necessity which exists for knowing, believing, and practicing them."[35] The synod and civil magistrates presiding over it had authority to use force only in the punishment of those who refused to temper their zeal in preaching on issues that the synod had been unable to resolve.[36] The actual resolutions passed in the synod could only be enforced by persuasion for "nothing is less a religious business than to employ coercion about religion."[37]

---

[34]Arminius, I, 183.

[35]Ibid., I, 175. The second point was the primary function of the synod. Arminius did not advocate toleration of diverse religious views. In fact he bitterly opposed it. But he did advocate the toleration of religious positions which, though contrary to the accepted standard of the majority, were not essential to the faith. When the synod was unable to reach agreement on a particular article, Arminius would have the conflicting parties consider "whether one cannot acknowledge the other for partakers of the same faith and fellow-heirs of the same salvation, although they may both hold different sentiments concerning the nature of faith and the manner of salvation." (I, 188).

[36]Ibid., I, 189.

[37]Ibid. Arminius quotes Tertullian here.

Thus, Arminius's appeal to civil authority was not based upon the policing power that authority could employ, but upon tho hope that mediation by a neutral party committed only to revealed truth, would result in the resolution of religious controversy.[38]

Arminius's oration contained only the germ of the Arminian theory of church-state relations that was formulated by Uytenbogaert after Arminius's death. Occasioned by the Arminian appeal to the States of Holland for mediation of the predestination controversy, this theory asserted not simply the desirability of civil direction of synods, but the justifiability of civil jurisdiction over all matters of faith and doctrine.

Uytenbogaert laid the foundation for the theory with a concept of sovereignty that denied the church any function save the religious administration of God's grace. Attacking the contra-Remonstrant theory of an interdependent and reciprocal relationship between church and state, the Arminian theory posited a concept of "unity of sovereignty" that made any partnership between church and state impossible; one had to be subordinated to the other.

> For there be many matters to be governed in the world, and every sorte have their owne proper administration and execution, so

---

[38]Arminius shared with his reformer predecessors and contemporaries the naive notion that "the truth" was apparent in Scriptures for all who sought therein.

> that of necessity there must be
> severall persons appointed for that
> purpose; yet nevertheless, the
> highest soveraigne government and
> supreme Jurisdiction can admitt
> no partners...[39]

That sovereignty had not been invested by God in the church, it belonged to the state, and the church was under it.

> ...God hath given the supreame
> superintendency, the chiefest com-
> mand and authority, over all cases
> and persons, both spirituall and
> temporall, and consequently the
> religion of forme, and manner of
> the publiq worship of God, unto
> the highest magistrate of every
> land: over the which he is
> soveraigne, Yet verily alwayes
> under God, and according to his
> Word: as thus,
>
> God: & his word
> The Soveraigne Magistrate
> The Clergie
>
> Here we see a superiority of the
> Soveraigne Magistrate, under God &
> his word, above the Clergie.[40]

The basic and guiding notion behind Uytenbogaert's theory was the ideal of corpus christianum, that permitted no distinction between temporal and spiritual. In line with the Genevan model of Calvin, it made the civil authority directly responsible to God for the spiritual welfare of the state. Insofar as the church required governing of government of any kind, it was the function of the sovereign to provide it. This involved the appointment of high church

---

[39]Quoted in Nobb, p. 42.

[40]Quoted in ibid., p. 29.

officials, the calling of church synods, jurisdiction over church policy and church constitution.[41] To the exclusive realm of the church remained only the pastoral functions of preaching and administering sacraments.

> Whence I speake of Authority, Command, Power and Jurisdiction, then I doe not understand, the exercising of the office of preaching, with the appertinents thereof; but the soveraigne, superintendent care, & (as the very words do emport) authority and command, as well over the persons that doe the office, as over the manner of administration, and exercise itselfe.[42]

In short, the Arminian theory was an Erastian formula of church-state relations.

This Erastian aspect of Arminianism created a peculiar dilemma for the English establishment under the early Stuarts. Erastian in church-state relations, and Calvinistic in theology, James I was unwilling to effect a consistent, comprehensive policy in regard to Dutch Arminianism. When the Laudian system gained official favor under Charles, the Arminian dilemma was reversed. Laudianism in practice abandoned Elizabethan Erastianism in favor of the church-state partnership, and theologically sympathized with the Arminian rather than the Calvinistic concepts of predestination.

The dilemma was resolved largely by ignoring the

---

[41] Ibid., p. 41.

[42] Quoted in ibid., p. 36.

Erastian aspect of Arminianism. Whether referred to in a Dutch or English context, with disfavor or with favor, the term "Arminian" had reference only to the predestination issue. During most of James's reign, "Arminian" meant the particular Dutch heresy against orthodox predestination theology that was condemned at Dort. During Charles's reign, the word came to have a particular English significance exclusive of its Dutch origins, but that significance still did not include the Erastian element in Dutch Arminianism. The English Puritans labelled as "Arminian" any indication of Roman sympathies within the English Church. While anti-Calvinist predestination theology qualified as such an indicator, the issue of Erastianism did not enter into the question of the Romanization of the English Church.

Thus in England, Arminianism in its most specific sense meant an attack on Calvinist predestination theology, more generally, any attack on religious orthodoxy, and most generally, an effort to redirect the English Church toward the direction of Rome.

C H A P T E R II

THE CAMBRIDGE CONTROVERSY

The term "Arminian" cannot be applied properly to the English setting before the crystallization of the movement in the Netherlands during the second decade of the seventeenth century.[1] But long before the seventeenth century there did appear in England reactions against the Calvinist theory of predestination that even in details bore a striking resemblance to the later Dutch theology. Like the Dutch Arminians, these English anti-Calvinists attacked the Genevan theology on its basic doctrines of: (1) the total depravity of man, (2) unconditional election and reprobation, (3) limited atonement through Christ, (4) the indefectibility of grace or the perseverance of the elect. Of the five points of Calvinism that emerged as the contended issues at the Synod of Dort,[2] only the doctrine of irresistible grace was absent in the early English controversies. In addition,

---

[1]H.C. Porter (Reformation..., p. 408) sets the date at 1610, the Gouda meeting from which emerged the Grand Remonstrance. Harrison (Arminianism, pp. 64-65) claims that the term becomes relevant in England only in 1613 when Grotius defended the "new theology" to James I. For the sake of precision I have used quotation marks around the word "Arminian" when referring to the anti-Calvinist theology that predated the Dutch theology.

[2]Total depravity of man; unconditional election and reprobation; limited atonement; irresistible grace; and indefectible grace.

much of the controversy in England centered around the Calvinist doctrine of assurance which was not a major issue at the Dutch synod.

It was not only in points of attack, but also in positive theology that the English churchmen anticipated their Dutch brethren. Although no full theological system comparable to that of Arminius was developed in England,[3] such doctrines as the autonomy of man's will, predestination conditioned by prescience, and reprobation grounded in man's sins were strongly asserted.

Thus if one loosely defines Arminian theology as a movement of thought in the direction of the liberalization of Calvinistic predestination theology,[4] it is possible to speak of an "Arminian" type theology in England before the development of Dutch Arminianism.

The earliest anti-Calvinist or "Arminian" (in the loose sense) theories of predestination appeared simultaneously with the development of the Genevan tradition in England.[5] But the development of "Arminianism" as an

---

[3]"The Arminians of England were in no sense a coherent or organized school of theology." Owen Chadwick, "Arminianism in England," Religion in Life, XXIX (Autumn, 1960), 548.

[4]This involves a slight alteration on Porter's definition - "a movement of thought in the direction of a more liberal theology." (Reformation..., p. 408). The purpose of the alteration is to emphasize the anti-Calvinist character of English Arminianism. See note 28, Chapter I of this study.

[5]Attempts to trace the English Arminian tradition back

intellectual and religious school of thought was much slower and less conspicuous than that of its Calvinistic counterpart. Until late in the sixteenth century, reactions against Calvinistic predestination theology were hardly more than the response of various independent churchmen who feared a Calvinist "take-over" of the Church of England. A major confrontation between the two schools of thought did not occur until the Cambridge controversies of 1595. By this time the "Arminian" tradition was seen as a significant

---

to pre-Elizabethan debates over election ignore the intimate and necessary relationship between Arminianism and Calvinism. Although I have taken the liberty of speaking of "Arminianism" (in quotation marks) outside of, and independent of the Dutch context, to also rob the term of its anti-Calvinist (in the orthodox sense) connotation seems to be going too far. One is left with an empty term which, though perhaps theologically relevant as far back as the early church fathers, has little historical meaning. In his Reformation..., p. 338, and in his article, "The Anglicanism of Archbishop Whitgift," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XXXI (June, 1962), 133, H.C. Porter implies some connection between English Arminians in the 1590's and certain disputes during the reigns of Edward and Mary. But, although Calvinism "in its sublapsarian and milder form, was known and embraced in England..." as early as the reign of Edward VI (Edward Cardwell, ed., Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England /Oxford, 1844/, I, note p. 50), Calvinist doctrine in its fullest terms was not accepted as the orthodox position even among ardent Puritans until the reign of Elizabeth (Marshall M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism /Chicago, 1939/, pp. 368-89, and Dawley, p. 217). The Freewill movement has also been viewed as a form of early or primative Arminianism (Knappen, p. 151 and Hargrave, p. 241). But this movement attacked not orthodox Calvinism, but the doctrine of election taught by the moderate school of predestination theology described in Chapter I of the study. See also R. Laurence, Authentic Documents Relating to the Predestinarian Controversy, Which Took Place Among Those Who Were Imprisoned For Their Adherence to the Doctrines of the Reformation by Queen Mary (Oxford, 1819).

threat to Calvinists who felt their own position to be strong enough vis-a-vis the moderate Establishment to risk an open effort at suppressing the opposition.[6]

The establishment of the Calvinist position in England was the work of the returned Marian exiles and the Calvin-obsessed Puritan party. Through their efforts, the writings of Calvin and Beza were translated and propagated in England.[7] In the early years of Elizabeth the views of the advocates of the more extreme doctrine of predestination were not received without hostility, but neither were their preachings silenced by the Establishment.[8] In fact, the proselytizing of the returned exiles was so effective that by the year 1582 a catechism on predestination, framed by some person unknown "whether Cartwright, Travers, or some others,"[9]

---

[6]It seems reasonable to assume that the Calvinists were encouraged by the fact that the Establishment had maintained silence in the face of the growing influence and popularity of Calvinist predestination theology, and had shown no inclination to get involved in the few confrontations that had occured previous to the 1590's. At most, moderates had attempted to enforce their own position of avoiding all speculation and debate over predestination.

[7]Peter Heylyn points out (Ecclesia Vindicata, or The Church of England Justified /London, 1657/, II, 185) that the work of the Marian exiles began before their return. Referring to the years 1555-56 he says: "From this time the Calvinian doctrine of predestination began to be dispersed in English pamphlets, as the only necessary, orthodox and saving truth."

[8]Millar MacLure, The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642 (Toronto, 1958), pp. 56-57.

[9]Strype, Annals..., III, Part I, p. 226.

was attached to many English Bibles.[10] This catechism asserted the doctrines of absolute election, reprobation, and the perseverance of the elect.

> Some are vessels of wrath, ordained unto destruction; as others are vessels of mercy, prepared to glory.
>
> ...as God's purpose is not changeable, so he repenteth not the gifts and graces of his adoption. Neither doth he cast off those whom he hath once received.
>
> ...the spirit of adoption is never taken from them that hath once received it...[11]

By the end of the century the Calvinist doctrine had been fully formulated; and in the 1590's it was presented in its most extreme form in the works of the Puritan preacher William Perkins, lecturer at Saint Andrews at Cambridge.[12]

The earliest evidence of an attack on the Calvinist theology that can be labelled as "Arminian" in character appeared in a pamphlet written early in Elizabeth's reign. It was directed specifically against the Calvinist views contained in pamphlets written during Edward's reign, works

---

[10]See ibid., III, Part II, pp. 238-41 for a copy of the catechism.

[11]Ibid., III, 239-40.

[12]Knappen (pp. 368-69) claims that with Perkins the Puritans for the first time reached full agreement in accepting the supralapsarian doctrine as orthodox. See also I. Breward, "The Life and Theology of William Perkins 1558-1602" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manchester, 1963), and Porter, Reformation..., pp. 288-314.

composed in Genevan exile during Mary's reign, and in the glosses the recently returned exiles had made to the Bible.[13] Rather fully entitled The Copie of an Answere unto a Certaine Letter Wherein the Answerer Purgeth Himselfe and Others, from Pelagius Errours, and from the Erroure of Free Will, or Justification of Works; Wherewithal He seemeth to Be Charged by the Said Letter: and Further, He Showeth Wherein He differeth in Judgement from Certaine English Writers and Preachers, Whom He Chargeth with Teaching of False Doctrine, under the Name of Predestination, the work bore no author's name. It was dated, however, on the title page as "published about the second or third year of Q. Elizabeth."[14] The author has been identified as one John Champneys about whom very little is known.[15] In Edward's

---

[13]The specific works referred to in the pamphlet are: Edward Crowley, The Confutation of XIII Articles (1548), a work dealing not specifically with predestination, but with refuting the thirteen points of Catholic doctrine; John Knox, Answer to a Great Number of Blasphemous Cavillations (1560) and First Blast of the Trumpet Against the Monstrous Regimont of Women (1556); Anthony Gilby, Brief Treatise of Election and Reprobation with Certen Answers to the Objections of the Doctrine (1556); and the translation and glosses to the Genevan Bible.

[14]It was republished in 1631 as part of a collection of anti-Calvinist works, edited by John Ailward and entitled An Historical Narration of the Judgment of Some Most Learned and Godly English Bishops, Holy Martyrs, and Others, Concerning God's Election, and the Merit of Christ His Death (London, 1631).

[15]Champneys is linked with the work in a response written by the Calvinist John Vernon, A Fruteful Treatise of Predestination and of the Devyne Providence of God, With an Apology of the Same Against the Swyniyshe Gruntinge of

reign Champneys was disciplined for having anabaptist views;[16] during Mary's reign he fled to the continent, returning to England with the accesion of Elizabeth.

Champneys began his work by disassociating himself from Pelagianism, placing his own position somewhere between the "Doating Dreams of Destiny" and the "Absolute Free Will of Papistry."[17] From there he attacked the Calvinist doctrine of predestination in general, and of election and reprobation in particular.[18] He attacked the Calvinistic concept of predestination primarily for making God the author of sin. Since God was the author of all that he predestined, and Adam's fall "...is the fountain of all sin,"[19] "the well-spring of All wickednesse and the Filthy-

---

the Epicures and Atheystes of Oure Time (London, 1561?). See Hargrave, p. 208. Heylyn also identifies Champneys as the author in his Historia Quinquarticularis or a Declaration of the Judgment of the Western Churches, and More Particularly of the Church of England, in the Five Controverted Points, Reproached in These Last Times by the Names of Arminianism (London, 1660), Part II, pp. 12-13.

[16]MacLure, p. 48 and Richard W. Dixon, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction (London, 1884-1903), III, 39-40. Also Heylyn, Ecclesia Restaurata; or the History of the Reformation of the Church of England, ed. James Craigie Robertson (Cambridge, 1849), Part III, p. 3.

[17]Champneys, pp. 13-14.

[18]Nowhere in the treatise does Champneys mention the word "Calvinist." He refers to Calvinists by the phrase "those who teach..."

[19]Champneys, p. 18.

Fountaine of all our Uncleannesse,"[20] if God predestined Adam's fall, as the Calvinists taught, it followed that God was the author not only of Adam's sin, but of all evil and treachery. The wicked could not be held responsible, for man was a mere puppet moved by a Stoic or Manichean type necessity.[21]

> God's predestination were like a Tempest of Winde, So blowing in the Sayles of Mans heart, that, by It, He is carried Headlong to all things whatsoever he doth.[22]
>
> ...what is our life, but a mere Destiny? All our Doings, Gods ordinances; and All our Imaginations, Branches of Gods Predestination?[23]

In place of the Calvinist notion of predestination, Champneys set a synergistic doctrine.

> Though God fore-seeth all Things, yet doth he not predestinate all things. For, His Fore-sight doth extend, Both to Good and Evill; But His predestination is ONELY of things, that bee Good.[24]

Despite the similarity in point of attack, and Champneys's reference to God's prescience, he appears to have been closer to the moderate Melancthonian compromise than to the

---

[20] Ibid., p. 21.

[21] Ibid., pp. 25, 32.

[22] Ibid., p. 34.

[23] Ibid., p. 26.

[24] Ibid., p. 28.

Dutch Arminian accommodation of predestination.

In the second part of the treatise -- the attack on the Calvinist doctrines of election and reprobation -- Champneys's arguments were more akin to the later Dutch theology. He was primarily concerned with the role of sin in reprobation, and of Christ in election. With numerous references to Augustine,[25] Champneys completely discredited the Calvinistic portrayal of reprobation as having its primary source in God's will and pleasure, and of election as having its primary source in God's predestination. Not God's will and pleasure, but man's own sin was the ultimate cause of reprobation; not God's predestination, but his mercy in Christ was the primary cause of election.[26]

Champneys's work evoked a response from the Calvinists,[27] but it did not mark the beginning of an anti-Calvinist intellectual movement or tradition. Nevertheless, the petition of one Thomas Talbot, parson of St. Mary Magdalen, Milk-Street, London, in 1562 seeking liberty of conscience for himself and his parishioners who held "that God doth foreknow and not predestinate, any evil, wickedness,

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 52ff.

[26] Ibid., pp. 58ff., 63-64.

[27] Specifically, from John Veron, Reader in the Church of St. Paul's and one of the chaplains to the Queen, and from Robert Crowley, parson of St. Giles in London and author of The Confutation of XIII Articles which Champneys had attacked.

or sin, in any behalf"[28] does indicate the existence of a group of Englishmen sympathetic to the position set forth by Champneys.

In the 1570's the anti-Calvinist position was set forth by one Antonio de Corro, a Spanish monk who had migrated to England in 1567. While pastor of the Spanish branch of the Strangers' Church in London, de Corro aroused suspicion among his French and Italian counterparts by the liberal contents of his preaching. His first work, Tableau de l'oeuvre de Dieu (1569), set forth the anti-Calvinist view that election and salvation were offered to all through Christ. This work brought no immediate response, but Corro was not so fortunate when the same views were expressed in his second work, a compilation of his lectures at Temple Church in London to which he had gone as Latin Reader in Divinity in 1571. Entitled A Theological Dialogue, Wherein the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Romans Is Expounded (London, 1574), the work was greeted with hostility by Richard Alvey, Master of the Temple, who complained to Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, of Corro's "affirming free will, and speaking not wisely of predestination, and suspiciously uttering his judgment of Arianism..."[29]

---

[28] Strype, Annals..., I, 495.

[29] Letter from Matthew Parker to Edmund Grindal, dated March 17, 1574 in Matthew Parker, Correspondence, ed. John Bruce (Cambridge, 1853), p. 476.

In 1576 Corro went to Oxford seeking to obtain a D.D. degree without having previously received the usual lower degree. Despite letters of recommendation from the Chancellor, the Earl of Leicester, he was immediately held suspect by the Calvinists in that university. His efforts to clear himself before the Houses of Convocation at Oxford did nothing to alleviate those suspicions. In a letter to Laurence Humphrey, vice-chancellor of Oxford, John Reynolds of Corpus Christi College compared Corro to Pelagius saying:

> I might seem to suspect this without a cause of Antonius Corranus, if himself had not brought certain Tables with him which he doth scatter abroad, wherein this man having promised such plainness and perspicuitie in his obscure points unto the high Comissioners, doth still hide his doctrine with such cloudes of darkness, that the seeds of Pelagianisme before noted in him, seeme yet to growe in it.
>
> ...his obscure speeches do give just suspicion of verie great heresies about predestination and justification by faith, two the chiefest points of Christian religion.[30]

Though Corro failed to receive the Oxford degree, through the intervention of the Chancellor and the Queen's Councils, he did gain a position as lecturer for Gloucester, St. Mary's and Hart Hall.[31] But the complaints against him did not

---

[30]Quoted in Anthony Wood, The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed. John Gutch (Oxford, 1792-96), II, 182.

[31]Ibid., II, 196.

cease. As late as 1578 ministers of Belgian, French, and Spanish Churches in London sent letters to Oxford accusing Corro "of divers crimes and heresies." The letters were read publicly in the Convocation "all being believed by some, especially the zealous and puritanical party..."[32]

Like Champneys, Corro left no heritage or following which could be identified as the seedbed of the English "Arminian" tradition.

The first prominent Englishman to advocate what appears to have been in some points an anti-Calvinist view was, oddly enough, a moderate, and an ardent supporter of the Elizabethan via media -- Richard Hooker. In a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1581 Hooker supposedly had maintained, in contradiction to Calvin, that there were in God two wills -- "an antecedent and a consequent will," and the determination of God touching reprobates was of the consequent will since by the antecedent will God would save all men.[33]

In his controversy with the Calvinist William Travers in 1584 Hooker was accused of teaching "certain things

---

[32] Ibid.

[33] I use the word "supposedly" because the sermon was not preserved. We know its contents only from Hooker's biographer, Isaac Walton. See Hooker, Works, I, 22-23. Hooker repeats and elaborates upon the points Walton attributes to the Paul's Cross Sermon in his Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Book V, xlix, 3-4.

concerning predestination otherwise than the Word of God doth."[34] Travers's chief objections were to Hooker's Temple sermon "On the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect," and his discourse "On Justification, Works, and How the Foundation of Faith is Overthrown," in which Hooker had attacked the Calvinist doctrines of perseverance and of certainty in the elect.[35]

> ...such is our weak and wavering nature, we have no sooner received grace, but we are ready to fall from it.[36]

> ...the strongest in faith that liveth upon the earth, hath always need to labour, and strive, and pray, that his assurance concerning heavenly and spiritual things may grow...[37]

The Hooker-Travers controversy did not result in any open confrontation between the Calvinist and anti-Calvinist positions. Travers was silenced not for his theological views, but for his faulty ordination. And Hooker did not defend his views save as his own openly maintained opinions.[38] Moreover, unlike the Cambridge "Arminians" of the next decade, Hooker's avowed goal was not the refutation of

---

[34]Hooker, III, 558-59.

[35]For the Travers controversy, see also Brooke, p. 107, and Jeremy Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain (London, 1852), VII, 150.

[36]Hooker, III, 476.

[37]Ibid., III, 577.

[38]Ibid., III, 576.

the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, but the rational defense of the Elizabethan position. It was only in the course of this defense that he unwittingly got himself involved in a critique of Calvin's system. If anything, Hooker, in the moderate tradition, would seem to have preferred to avoid any controversy on predestination.[39] These facts combined with Hooker's rather tenuous connection with later Arminian-Calvinist dialogues[40] make it difficult to see Hooker's connection with "Arminian" theology in England as anything more than coincidental.

The first incidence of a public attack specifically and intentionally critical of Calvinian predestination by one directly connected with the later "Arminian" tradition, was in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in October 1584 by Samuel Harsnett.[41] A fellow of Pembroke College, Harsnett was a young man of twenty-three in 1584, who in that year had received his M.A. degree.

Using the text, Ezekial xxxiii, 11 ("As I live, saith the Lord, I delight not in the death of the wicked"), Harsnett attacked the Calvinists on absolute reprobation and election, depravity of man, and limited atonement. Justify-

---

[39]Collier, VII, 150.

[40]See Chapter III of this study.

[41]A Sermon Preached at Paul's Cross appended to Three Sermons by Dr. Richard Stewart, Dean of St. Paul's (London, 1648).

ing his choice of topic, Harsnett said:

> There is a conceit in the world (beloved) [which] speaks little better of our gracious God than this:...That God should design many thousands of souls to Hell before they were, not in eye to their faults, but his own absolute will and power, and to get him glory in their damnation. This opinion has grown high and monstrous (like a Goliah) and men do shake and tremble at it; yet never a man reacheth to David's sling to cast it down. In the name of the Lord of Hosts; we will encounter it: for it hath reviled, not the Host of the living God, but the Lord of Hosts.[42]

In addition to repeating Champneys's argument that the Calvinistic theory made God the author of sin,[43] Harsnett used the Calvinists's own stress upon Scriptural authority to attack their position on reprobation.

> ...for whereas God in this text doth say and swear, that he doth not delight in the death of man, this opinion saith, that not one, or two, but millions of men should fry in hell...and that for no other cause but his mere pleasure sake.[44]

The spirit of Harsnett's sermon was neither the scholarly, rational approach of Hooker, nor the indirect approach of Champneys and Corro who both had avoided specific references to Genevan reformers. With little reticence and none of the

---

[42]Harsnett, pp. 121, 133-34.

[43]Ibid., pp. 134-35.

[44]Ibid., p. 134.

reverence typically shown the Genevan reformers, Harsnett openly attacked both the Genevan school and its Master.

> The spirit of Peter (a great deal wiser than that of Geneva) saith plainly, "God would not have any one to perish." Since it hath pleased Almighty God there to say it...I trust, we shall have grace to believe him; since himself can better tell what himself would have, than the man of Geneva can.[45]

Harsnett asserted that man's sin was the sole cause of his reprobation, and his free acceptance of God's grace the cause of his election. Quoting Augustine, he reaffirmed man's role in his own salvation -- "he that created thee without thee, doth not save thee without thee."[46] In Paradise man's salvation depended on his abstaining from eating the forbidden fruit; in his fallen state, it depended upon his obeying God's law; with the coming of Christ, it depended upon man's acceptance of God's gift of grace through Christ.[47] That gift of grace was offered to all, and effec-

---

[45]Ibid., pp. 153-54. It is unclear here whether Harsnett was referring to Calvin or to Beza. J.B. Mullinger, (The University of Cambridge /Cambridge, 1873-1911/, II, 331) notes that in the 1580's even among moderate churchmen there was a growing "disinclination to defer, as readily as before, to the views of the continental Reformers." By 1593 Bancrodt felt free to compare the dictatorial tones of Beza with Leo the Great, and Whitgift charged the Genevan reformers with creating disturbance in the English Church. See John Strype, The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D., the Third and Last Lord Archbishop of Canterbury in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth... (Oxford, 1822), II, 158-59 and Brook, pp. 156-57.

[46]Harsnett, p. 155.

[47]Ibid.

tual for all. That all were not actually saved was due not to any defect in God's grace (a reference to the distinction between sufficient and efficacious grace), "but" to a defect "in them who despise and abuse the Grace."[48]

Unlike the Dutch Arminius, Harsnett did not affirm even a predestination based upon God's foreknowledge. The absence of any positive scheme of predestination in the six resolutions with which he summarized his critique of Calvinism is glaring:

> 1. God's absolute will is not the cause of Reprobation; but sin.
>
> 2. No man is of an absolute necessity the childe of Hell, so as by God's Grace, he may not avoid it.
>
> 3. God simply willeth and wisheth every living Soul to be saved, and to come to the Kingdom of Heaven.
>
> 4. God sent his Sonne to save every Soule, and to bring it to the Kingdom of Heaven.
>
> 5. God's Son offereth Grace effectually to save every one, and to direct him to the Kingdom of Heaven.
>
> 6. The neglect and contempt of his Grace, is the cause why every one doth not come to Heaven; and not any privative Decree, Counsel or determination of God.[49]

Despite the absence of a concept of predestination in Harsnett's summary, he was not an advocate of salvation through

---

[48] Ibid., p. 160.

[49] Ibid., p. 148.

good works or free will. Harsnett closed his sermon with strong warnings against the errors of Papist, Pelegian and Puritan alike.

> Let us take heed and beware, that we neither (with the Papists) rely upon our free will: nor (with the Pelagian) upon our Nature: nor (with the Puritan) Curse God and die, laying the burden of our sins on his shoulders and the guilt of them at his everlasting doores: but let us fall downe upon our faces, give glory to God and say "Unto thee, O Lord belongeth mercy and forgiveness."[50]

Although some historians have claimed that Harsnett in no way was censured for this sermon,[51] the Journals of the House of Lords records Harsnett as saying that he was "checked by the Lord Archbishop Whitgift, and commanded to preach no more of it."[52]

In the years immediately preceding and following this sermon the Calvinists seemed to have gathered strength and unity both within and outside of Cambridge. In the early 1590's William Perkins published his Golden Chain (1590) and Case of Conscience (1592) which strongly reaffirmed the supralapsarian position. Also, by this time churchmen with strong Calvinistic predilections had gained high positions

---

[50] Ibid., p. 165

[51] Heylyn, Historia Quinquarticularis..., Part III, 38ff, and Collier, VII, 192.

[52] Journals of the House of Lords, III, 389.

and masterships in many of the Cambridge colleges: Roger Goad, Provost of King's College; John Duport, Master of Jesus College; Edmund Barwel, Master of Christ's College; Robert Some, Master of Peterhouse; Laurence Chaderton, Master of Emmanuel; John Jegon, Master of Corpus Christi; Humphrey Tyndall, Master of Queen's; and William Whitaker, Master of St. John's.[53] Of these eight, at least six had obtained their masterships between 1580 and 1590. Their average age in 1590 was 47+.[54]

No such influence was to be found among those known to have had even latent "Arminian" sympathies.[55] In the

---

[53]Strype mentions seven of the above Heads as being in sympathy with Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. (The Life and Acts..., II, 228). He does not mention Jegon of Corpus Christi, but Jegon was an active complainant against the liberal theology represented by Barret and Baro. See Strype, ibid., II, 235, 248 and Strype, Annals..., IV, 312-320. Porter points out the difficulty of identifying Puritans in this period. He used as his criteria in Reformation... (a) the lists of those who petitioned for Cartwright in 1570; (b) petitioners against the new University statutes in 1572; (c) supporters of Francis Johnson in 1589; and (d) opponents of Barret in 1595. All of the above named Heads satisfy two or more of these criteria.

[54]As the birth date of John Duport is not known, he was not included in the average. Edmund Barwel's birth date is not given in the Dictionary of National Biography, but according to C.H. Cooper and T. Cooper (Athenae Cantabrigienes /Cambridge, 1858-1913/, III, 522), Barwel received his B.A. in 1567-68, at which time the ages of the "Arminian" sympathizers mentioned raged from six to twelve years.

[55]The identification of the "latent Arminians," of course, is made with the benefit of historical hindsight. With the exception of Harsnett, none of the following had yet voiced "Arminian" views.

early 1590's Samuel Harsnett was a fellow at Pembroke; John Overall, a fellow at Trinity; only Lancelot Andrewes, Master of Pembroke, held a position comparable to that of the Calvinists.[56] The average age of these anti-Calvinists in 1590 was 30+. Thus descriptions of the "Arminian movement" at Cambridge in the 1590's as youthful and novelist would seem to be accurate in spite of recent interpretations to the contrary.[57]

---

[56] In Oxford and Cambridge in Transition (Oxford, 1959), p. 222, Mark Curtis mentions Thomas Playfere as sympathetic with the anti-Calvinists. He cites Strype, Life and Acts... as his source. But Strype makes no mention of Playfere. Moreover Playfere's sermon, Sickeman's Couch (preached in 1604 and printed in 1633) presents a Calvinistic doctrine of assurance and perseverance. John Playfere, possibly a relative of Thomas, did have Arminian views. See his Appeal to Gospel For True Doctrine of Predestination in A Collection of Tracts Concerning Predestination and Providence, and Other Points Depending Upon Them (Cambridge, 1719). His birth date and education are not known; he can be traced to Cambridge in 1600 at the earliest.

[57] The traditional interpretation of the Cambridge controversies has maintained that the Calvinists "had gained great footing in Cambridge, especially amongst the heads; insomuch that those who held the other side of the question were little better than novelists." (Collier, VII, 184). Mark Curtis (Oxford and Cambridge..., p. 222), Brook (pp. 160-61), Mullinger (The University of Cambridge, II, 325), V.H.H. Green (Religion at Oxford and Cambridge /London, 1964/, p. 107) and Owen Chadwick (p. 549) all tend to go along with this interpretation. H.C. Porter, on the other hand, has advanced the view that "the disputes of the 1590's ...must be interpreted not as a study of reigning and resplendent Calvinism challenged by upstart Arminianism, but as the rear-guard action of one important party on seeing another important party beginning to capture a little too much territory, upsetting, as it were, the theological balance of power." (Reformation..., p. 287, and repeated in "The Anglicanism...", p. 129). Porter does not seem to have much more to back up this revision of the traditional interpretation than his own vehemence. He accounts neither for

The "spiritual father" of this young group was the Frenchman Peter Baro, a close friend and associate of Corro, who had come to England under the patronage of Burghley and Andrew Perne (Master of Peterhouse) in 1572. By 1574 Baro had been appointed Lady Margaret professor.[58]

For twenty years before the outbreak of the 1595 controversy Baro had maintained and taught "a different Doctrine of Predestination from that which had been taught by Calvin and his Disciples, but he was never quarreled for it till the year 1595..."[59] In these early years Baro did not seek a confrontation with the Calvinists. He did seek to present and teach theses and views which ran directly counter to the Calvinistic doctrines of total depravity, absolute election and reprobation. In two of Baro's works written before 1595 he emphasized the freedom of man's will, and attempted to reconcile this freedom with the omnipotence of God's will. As early as 1579 he had presented in a series of lectures on Jonah an "Arminian" alternative to absolute election and reprobation.

---

the generation gap between Calvinists and "Arminians," nor for the difference in their prestige within the University hierarchy. Heylyn did anticipate Porter's interpretation. Speaking of Barret's "Arminianism" he says, "There must be many more Barrets who concurred with the same opinions with them in the University, though their names through the envy of those times are not come unto us." (Historia Quinquarticularis..., Part III, p. 76).

[58]Cooper, II, 274-75.

[59]Heylyn, Aerius Redivivus Or the History of the Presbyterians (London, 1670), p. 342.

> It is the will of God we should have eternal life, if we believe and persevere in the faith of Christ; but if we do not believe, or fall short in our perseverance, then it is not the will of God we should be saved.[60]

In a sermon preached in 1588 Baro directly asserted that "God's purpose and decree taketh not away the libertie of man's corrupt will."[61] "Lord and master of his actions," man "alone may be deemed the author of sinne..."[62] For Baro, as for Champneys, predestination was based upon God's foreknowledge, not upon man's bondage. Insofar as man acted out of his own corrupt nature, he would choose evil; insofar as he acted out of God's grace, he would choose good. Again, like Champneys, Baro relied heavily upon Augustine.

> To doo a thing freely, is the propertie of mans nature, and so coupled with reason, that it cannot be separated from it: by doing freely to choose evill, is the propertie of corrupt nature; but to choose good, is the gift of grace.[63]

Dealing directly with the Calvinist concern for God's

---

[60]Quoted in Collier, VII, 189. "Dei voluntas est, ut vitam habeamus, si credamus: & Dei voluntas non est, ut vitam habeamus, nisi credamus: aut, si credentes perseveremus."

[61]Peter Baro, Fower Sermons and Two Questions as They were Uttered and Disputed ad clerum in S. Maries Church and Schools in Cambridge appended to A Special Treatise of God's Providence by Andreas Gerardus (London, 1588?), p. 502.

[62]Ibid., p. 519.

[63]Ibid.

omnipotence, he asserted that man's freedom in no way detracted from God. In creation God had ordained that freedom, just as he had ordered in addition to necessary causes, causes "free and contingent: which according to their several natures might work freely and contingently, or not work." God's decrees in no way destroyed the free will for "God the creator and governor of all things is not the destroyer of the order by him appointed, but the preserver."[64]

Despite these anti-Calvinist views, Baro was not openly attacked by the Cambridge Calvinists. In 1581 he did get involved in a quarrel with the Calvinist Laurence Chaderton, then fellow of Christ's College, and later a major figure in the disputes of the 1590's as Master of Emmanuel College. The dispute of 1581 involved the nature and form of grace. Baro claimed that there were degrees of true faith, whereas the Calvinists argued as a corollary of their doctrine of indefectibility, that only a true and lasting faith was the product of God's grace.[65]

An uneasy peace was maintained for fourteen years until one William Barret, a protege of Baro, publicly attacked not only the Calvinist doctrines of reprobation and assur-

---

[64] Ibid., pp. 519-20.

[65] Strype, Annals..., III, Part I, p. 68. Baro's theses were: "Primus Dei amor est de natura fidei justificantis"; and "Fides justificans praecipitur in Decalogo."

ance, but the master himself.[66] Fellow of Gonville and Caius College and candidate for the B.D. degree, Barret voiced his "Arminian" opinions in a sermon delivered at St. Mary's Church on April 29, 1595.[67] Barret was a disciple of Baro, and one of the younger generation whom the older scholar had "emboldened to maintain false doctrine, to the corrupting and disturbing of this university and church..."[68]

Shortly after having delivered his sermon, Barret was interviewed by the Vice-chancellor, John Duport. The meeting was unsuccessful, and Duport, who appealed to Whitgift for advice, was instructed to continue his efforts to maintain theological peace, and, in the meanwhile, to keep the Archbishop informed of any new developments. The following

---

[66]Heylyn claimed that the whole controversy at Cambridge "in the year 1591, or thereabouts" was "occasioned by a Treatise published by William Perkins, a well known Divine,...entituled, Armilla Aurea or The Golden Chain..." Aerius Redivivus..., p. 342.

[67]This date is given in a summary of the Barret case now in University Archives, Registry Guard Books, VI, No. 59, fol. 11. The major primary source for the Cambridge controversy is a copybook of John Whitgift now in Trinity College Library, MS B/14/9. Many of the documents in the copybook have been published in volume III (Appendix) of John Strype, The Life and Acts... Volume II of the same work quotes copiously from the Trinity manuscript. The two other best secondary works are Porter, Reformation..., pp. 344ff. and Mullinger, II, 326-39, 347-49. Although Porter used the Trinity manuscript he does not cite the original when quoting from the Latin text.

[68]Letter from the Vice-chancellor and Heads to Chancellor Burghley. March 8, 1596. Quoted in Strype, Annals..., III, 321.

week, when Duport was absent from Cambridge, the deputy Vice-chancellor, Richard Some and eight Heads[69] cited the young scholar before Consistory Court and ordered him to read a retraction "drawn up by them and given to him by Dr. Some."[70]

The controversy would have stopped there, had Barret not read this retraction (May 10 at St. Mary's) "in such a manner as gave offense."[71] On May 26 a petition signed by sixty dons complaining of the tone of Barret's retraction appeared at Cambridge.[72] Cited again before the Consistory, and threatened with expulsion, Barret appealed to Whitgift complaining of a plot engineered by Some who "...had secretly solicited all the University men, who he thought favoured him or his opinion, by his friends; viz., certain Puritans; whose labor he had in this matter, and got their votes..."[73] Enclosed with the letter was a copy of an indictment (Barret called it a libel) that some members of St. John's had circulated.[74]

---

[69]Barwel, Goad, Tyndal. Whitaker, Jegon, Preston, Chaderton, and Clayton.

[70]Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 230-31.

[71]Ibid.

[72]See Porter, Reformation..., pp. 346ff. for a thorough analysis of the signatories of the petition.

[73]Quoted in ibid., p. 347.

[74]A copy of the indictment with Barret's marginal notes can be found in Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXIII, 320.

Not to be outdone by Barret, the Heads also appealed to Whitgift as well as to Burghley. Describing the sermon and the retraction "so strangely and unreverently performed," the Heads urged that "if Mr. Barret were either maintained by any in authority in those his dealings,...or not further censured, (both in him and in some others, whose disciple he was),...it would not only be a great discouragement to the godly professors of the religion established, but also an emboldening to such as were unquiet and ill-disposed, to proceed both in these points already begun, and in others not mentioned, of like or greater moment; to the further continuance and spreading of corruption in religion, and dissension among them; and so consequently, in the Church abroad."[75]

The real concern of the Calvinist Heads was not for Barret but for his mentor, Peter Baro. In a letter dated June 13 (a day after the letter noted above), William Whitaker, Regius Professor of Divinity and chief competitor of Baro for the minds of the younger generation, complained to the Archbishop of Baro's teaching in the schools "that justifying grace and faith might not only be lost, in some finally, but even in the elect, for a time totally..."[76]

The issue over Barret escalated only because the young

---

[75]Letter of June 12, 1595; quoted in Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 234.

[76]Quoted in ibid., II, 227.

man appealed directly to Whitgift who at the time was more concerned with the question of University jurisdiction than with the theological issues. In a letter to the Heads[77] Whitgift complained (1) of the "hasty and rash proceedings against Barret; (2) the usurpation of Whitgift's prerogative, (the University being within his special charge due to the vacancy of the bishopric of Ely); and (3) that the Heads had proceeded in matters wherein they had no authority. On the last point Whitgift was particularly irritated because Chancellor Burghley in an earlier meeting had agreed with Whitgift that the Heads "had done unadvisedly" in handling Barret, only to give the Heads permission to proceed as they saw fit after Some had convinced him that clause forty-five (the statuto de Concionibus) gave the Heads jurisdiction over the case.[78]

While relationships between Whitgift and the Heads worsened,[79] Barret took the politic step of again petition-

---

[77]Strype dates it June 8 (ibid., 238). Porter dates it June 19 (Reformation..., p. 356). The latter seems more correct as the contents of Whitgift's letter are in direct response to the June 12 letter of the Heads.

[78]Interestingly enough, it was this same clause which the Puritans had petitioned against in 1572.

[79]See the exchange of letters quoted in Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 247-53. The Heads make it clear that "in all matters they would be their own judges immediately under her Majesty; and in no case acknowledge any authority his Grace...had any way in these causes over them: either to determine what the doctrine was of the Church of England, or otherwise howsoever..." (II, 245). To further embitter relationships between Cambridge and the Archbishop, Some saw fit to ridicule Whitgift from the pulpit.

ing Whitgift, this time noting that "his Grace being he whom they ought and were willing to hear in this cause."[80]

That the tone of the Whitgift-Heads exchange improved by late summer was due in no small part to the efforts of Whitaker. In a mollifying letter to Whitgift in July he wrote:

> I humbly desire your Grace to think, that in the cause of Mr. Barret, we have been only caried with desire to remove the great offense given by him in our University...
>
> It is no smal grief unto us al, to perceive your Grace to take in evil part what we have don only in this respect. The which we judge to be so necessary and urgent, that if we had been negligent therin, we might justly have ocurred your Graces offence...
>
> Wee hope that our proceding hath been agreeable to statute; and that by statute we are authorized and enjoyned to do as much as we have done. And if herein we have been overseen, we desire to be enformed; and wil therupon acknowledge our error...[81]

By late summer the efforts of Whitaker to mollify Whitgift, and of Burghley to tone down the claims of the Heads[82] began

---

[80] Quoted in ibid., II, 244.

[81] Ibid., III, Document XXV, 337-38.

[82] Strype notes that the Heads were writing now "in more submission, (and, as it seems, by their Chancellor's order)." (Ibid., II, 259.) Mullinger (The University of Cambridge, II, 337-38) writes that Burghley advised the Heads "to memorialize the Archbishop, in order that Barret and his doctrines might be subjected to a fuller final decision."

to get results. In September Whitgift ordered the examination of Barret on eight points of doctrine.[83] The examiners led by Whitaker included Dupert, Tyndal, Barwel, and Chaderton. Subsequently the replies of Barret together with the comments of Whitaker were forwarded to the Archbishop. On the twenty-ninth of the month Whitgift responded with his own comments on Barret's replies, requesting that one or two of the Heads come with Barret to Lambeth "some time the next term." In the meantime he repeated his urging of July "that no man in pulpit within the University should deal in these causes, to or fro, until further order were taken."[84]

In November Tyndal and Whitaker accompanied Barret to Lambeth for the meeting with Whitgift. As a result of this meeting the University obtained not only the promise of Barret's retraction, but also the promised resolutions by which to maintain doctrinal conformity on predestination

---

[83]See Appendix I of this study for the eight questions put to Barret. There is some question about the authorship of the questions. Strype implies that Whitgift was the author (Ibid., II, 262-63, 266). Porter (Reformation..., p. 358) states that Whitgift was the author. W.D. Sargeaunt ("The Lambeth Articles," The Journal of Theological Studies, XII [January, 1911], 251-260 and [April, 1911], 427-436) claims that Whitaker was the author. I tend to agree with Sargeaunt (p. 256) because of the nature of the questions and Whitgift's comments on Barret's answers. If Whitgift were the author, why would he ask questions the answers to which were, in his opinion, a matter of doctrinal indifference to the Church of England? See pp. 83-84.

[84]Quoted in Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 273. See ibid., p. 253 for the letter of July 11.

and its related issues. The promise of the latter did not materialize, and the promise of Barret was not kept. So soon afterward Barret went to the Continent where he became a Roman Catholic. He later returned to England and in 1630, according to William Prynne, Barret "lives a layman's life, being still an open, dangerous, violent, and most pernicious seducing Papist, as some men of credit in these very terms have informed me, who both know, and will auerre him to be such a one."[85]

The theological questions raised within the context of the Barret controversy mainly had to do with the Calvinistic doctrines of assurance and perseverance. While the broader question of reprobation was raised, the full implications of neither that doctrine nor of the Calvinistic concept of election were directly challenged.

Barret's sermon at St. Mary's is not extant; but a general idea of his position can be ascertained from the recantation which the Calvinistic Heads would put into his mouth.[86]

The debate over the doctrine of assurance centered on Barret's distinction between certainty or assurance (certitudo)

---

[85]William Prynne, Anti-Arminianisme: Or the Church of England's Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme, etc. (London, 1630), p. 61.

[86]The recantation is an excellent source both for Barret's opinions and those of the Calvinists. Each point of the recantation first states the opinion to be recanted, and then the position to be asserted in its place.

and security or confidence (securitas). In his sermon Barret had stated:

> ...there is no one...ought to be confident by revelation of his own salvation.[87]

Elaborating on the point to Whitgift, he argued that he did not deny that believers could and should be assured (certos) of salvation, "but to be confident (securos), that they ought not to be."[88]

The Calvinist Heads would have nothing of Barret's distinction. Although the term "securos" was not used in the New Testament, they argued that "he which hath a true justifying faith, remaineth not in a continual wavering and doubtfulness, but is assured of his salvation, and that by the ground and certainty of that justifying faith; because by that faith only, we apprehend and apply Christ to ourselves, whereby we have peace with God etc., and consequently a certainty and spiritual security."[89] Inacceptable to them was Barret's limitation of Christian assurance to "certos." In his retraction they had him affirm that the elect "by the certainty of their faith ought to be assured

---

[87]Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXII, 317. "...nisi...per revelationem, ut de salute sua debeat esse securus."

[88]Letter to Whitgift, May 1595. Quoted in ibid., II, 236.

[89]Letter of July 1595. Quoted in Porter, Reformation..., p. 319.

and confident of their salvation."[90] Unable to support their view with Biblical references, they argued that the term "securos" "is not only by some late writers and preachers, but by many ancient and Catholic Doctors of the Church so used."[91]

The point at issue between Barret and the Calvinists was more than a scholastic question of terminology. The Calvinist belief in the complete impotence of man covered both the elect and the reprobate. Just as the latter could do nothing to obtain salvation, the former could do nothing to deprive themselves of it. The assertion that the elect ought to be secure and confident of their salvation was but one more way to reaffirm the omnipotence of God and the impotence of man -- be he of the elect or of the reprobate. Barret's distinction between "securitas" and "certitudo" specifically qualified that impotence. In spite of his election, the elected man was not immune to temptation and sin. Subject to the perils of temptation he still had a responsible role in working out his salvation. Under such conditions the elect could in no way be confident of salvation. In fact confidence (securitas), unlike assurance (certitudo), had a detrimental effect on salvation.

---

[90]Underlining mine. Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXII, 317. "Ergo debere eos de salute sua, fidei ipsius certitudine, certos esse et securos."

[91]Heads to Whitgift, July 1595. Quoted in Porter, Reformation..., p. 319.

In support of Barret's distinction between the two terms, Hadrian Saravia, one of Whitgift's chaplains, noted that while assurance (certitudo) "arms believers in Christ against all temptations, and upraises them everywhere in desperate cases," confidence (securitas) made even the elect careless, sloppy, and forgetful of the need to guard against temptation.[92] No man could ever be so sure of his salvation that he could let down his guard. The example of King David, who, elect though he was, succumbed to the temptations of adultery, served as warning to those who would let assurance of salvation degenerate into condidence of salvation.[93] Quoting the Apostle Paul's warning to the Philippians, Saravia emphasized that the fate of the elect was not God's work alone. At least in the matter of temptation it was for man "...with fear and trembling to work out your own salvation..."[94]

> No man can be certus of attaining to the end who is not careful concerning the means to that end. Life eternal is promised us, by faith indeed we lay hold of it. But the way which leads to it is to be held fast.[95]

---

[92]Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXIV, 321, 323. "Haec certitudo adversus omnes tentationes in Christum, et in rebus desperatis ubique erigit..."

[93]Ibid., III, 323.

[94]Philippians 2:12 "...cum timore et tremore suam ipsorum operari salutem."

[95]Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXIV, 323. "Nemo certus de consequendo fine esse potest, qui de

The Calvinists also turned to the Apostle Paul. Passing over the Philippian passage quoted by Saravia, they pointed to Romans 8:38 wherein the Apostle said "I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, etc., shall be able to separate us from the love of God."[96] From this verse they contended that all the elect, like Paul, could be assured of salvation.

Barret, according to Whitaker's report to Whitgift, contended that Paul's assurance of salvation was due to a "private and extraordinary revelation." Consequently no generalization about assurance of salvation could be drawn from the passage in Romans.[97]

Of the same nature was the Calvinist assertion that the Lucan prayer of Christ for Peter - "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not" (Luke 22:32) - was for all the elect, who consequently could be assured of salvation. When asked his interpretation of the Lucan prayer, Barret

---

mediis quae ad illum finem conducant, non est sollicitus. Vita aeterna nobis promissa est, et eam quidem fide apprehendimus. Sed tenenda est via quae eo ducit."

[96]The term used by Paul, "persuaded," was translated in the Vulgate as "certus sum." Thus the question of securitas did not arise in this particular context.

[97]Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 263. The question put to Barret was "whether it was an extraordinary and private revelation concerning which St. Paul maketh mention, Romans 8:38 "I am persuaded, etc." Barret's answer, as quoted in ibid., II, 266 was: "...that Paul was not assured of his salvation, but by private and extraordinary revelation."

replied by discoursing generally on the verse in question.[98] This deliberate vagueness would seem to indicate that here too Barret would not generalize from the apostle to the elect. Barret's reply made a direct attack from the Calvinists impossible. Instead Whitaker took the opportunity to charge Barret with holding popish opinions - a charge that was to become a frequent Calvinistic response to Arminian dissent from orthodoxy.

> That the whole tenor of his answers was not only indirect and insufficient, but for the most part Popish also. That to the first interrogatory he answered not, Whether Christ prayed only for Peter, that his faith should not fail, yea or no. And that he could not by any means be brought to make a direct answer thereto. But discussed upon the place, Luke xxii, 32; alleging such places out of the Fathers as might seem to make most for the supremacy of St. Peter, and that were wholly alleged by the Papists for that purpose...And that so for any part of his answer, he might hold that our Saviour Christ prayed indeed for St. Peter, that his faith should not fail, just as Papists do.[99]

One of the specific points of Anglican doctrine upon which the controversy over assurance was focussed was the question of remission of sins. The Calvinist position expressed in the letter of the Heads to Whitgift in July 1595 held :

---

[98] Ibid., II, 263.

[99] Quoted in ibid., II, 265.

> That all and every one that hath a true justifying faith thereby may and might assure himself, not only that sins are remitted to the true believers in general, but much more to his comfort, that his own particular sins are, through the same faith in Christ, forgiven him.[100]

Barret did not deny or dissent from the Church's official position on remission of sins.[101] He did refuse to link it up with any doctrine of assurance for individuals and particular sins.

> ...it is not possible nor ought anyone truly to hold the belief certain that his own sins were remitted to him.[102]

Instead he would have Articles II and XXVII understood in their general sense - not forgiveness of particular sins, but God's forgiveness of man's sinfulness.

In answer to Whitaker's question on the remission of sins, however, he complicated the matter further by elaborating on the role of the Church, making reference to the necessity of penitential acts before the remission of

---

[100]Quoted in ibid., II, 249. See also Whitaker's letter of appeasement to Whitgift in ibid., III, Document XXV.

[101]Article II of the Thirty-nine Articles referring to the sacrifice of Christ states: "...to reconcile his father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also from all actual sins of man." (Underlining mine). Article XXVII states that baptism is a sign of "the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God..."

[102]Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXII, 318. "...nec posse, nec debere quenquam vere fidelem certo credere, peccata sua esse sibi remissa."

particular sins.[103] Again this was an "Arminian" like refusal to accept the Calvinistic philosophy of mortal impotence. Neither salvation in general nor remission of sins in particular could be effected independently of man's efforts on his own behalf. Unlike the synergistic predestination of Melancthon and Champneys this presentation attributed to man a major role in both election and reprobation. As a consequence, in matters of free will it came dangerously close to the Roman Catholic position so abhorrent to the Calvinists.

In the opinion of the Calvinist Heads, Barret had denied the doctrine of assurance by certainty of faith. In fact he had qualified, not denied, that doctrine. In his reply to the direct question, "Whether justifying faith doth not make us certain of our election; and adoption, and persuade, without all doubt, that we shall be saved?" he had answered in the affirmative with the single qualification that the certainty with which one held a belief in assurance was not comparable to the certainty with which one held such beliefs as the existence and unity of God.[104] Whereas the latter belief could be held categorically, assur-

---

[103]"...not that a man may believe remission of his sins, but that Christ hath given to his Church a power: so that the sins of this man, and that man, and every particular man, truly repenting, may be forgiven." Quoted in ibid., II, 265-66.

[104]Ibid., II, 270.

ance of salvation was conditional - dependent upon actual perseverance in faith. The justified could be assured of salvation if he persevered in faith. This particular affirmation of the doctrine of assurance was no basis for appeasing the Calvinists. To the contrary, it raised questions about the orthodoxy of Barret's views on the perseverance of the elect.

The Calvinist position on the indefectibility of grace maintained "that true justifying faith whereby we are ingrafted into Christ, is so fixed and certain to continue, that it can never be utterly lost or extinguished in them which have the said justifying faith."[105] Such faith "is so certain for the future that neither any temptations of the flesh, the world, or the devil himself can, plucking it up, root it out from the soul of the faithful...who once has it, he shall have it forever."[106] As with their theory of assurance, the Calvinists supported the doctrine of perseverance with generalizations from Christ's promises to the

---

[105] Quoted in Porter, Reformation..., p. 317. According to Porter (318-19) Whitaker was willing to concede that the elect could "depart from grace given" (recedere) as stated in Article XVI of the Thirty-nine, but they could not utterly fall from grace (excidere). In other words, the justified could sin, but never so grievously as to extinguish the spirit of grace.

[106] Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXII, 318. "...de futuro etiam certam, ut nunquam possit ullis tentationibus carnis, mundi, aut ipsius diaboli, e' fidelium animis radicitus evelli. Adeo ut, qui hanc semel habet, semper sit habiturus."

apostles, i.e., to Peter, Luke 22:32 ("I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.") and in John 17:20 ("I do not pray for these only, but also for those who believe in me through their word...").

In his sermon Barret opened attack on Calvinistic perseverance by again denying the validity of generalizing from the apostles to the elect.

> ...the faith of Peter was not capable of failing, (but) that of others could. Since, for the faith of individuals...Our Lord did not pray.[107]

From there Barret went on to attack the doctrine on grounds similar to those used by Saravia to criticize the Calvinistic concept of securitas. Perseverance like assurance, as understood by the Calvinists, was based upon a false pride, and arrogance in the capacity of elected man to resist temptation and sin.

> In regard to porseverance to the end, certainty about the future is proud, for it is by its own nature contingent ...neither did I affirm it to be proud only, but to be most wicked.[108]

From Barret's objections to the orthodox assertion, it might appear that the Calvinists granted too much to elected man. Actually the Calvinist theories granted

---

[107] Ibid., III, 317. "...Petri fidem deficere non potuisse asserui, at aliorum posse. Nam pro fide singulorum ...non oravit Dominus."

[108] Ibid. "Quoad finalem perseverantiam, superbam esse dixit illam securitatem de futuro, eoque natura sua contingent: ...Neque tantum superbam affirmavi, sed impiisimam."

nothing to him. Man's ultimate fate and the path thereto were both completely out of the range of human competence. The Calvinist claim - that the elect would certainly persevere in faith and could be sure and confident of salvation - was not based on any confidence in man's abilities. The supralapsarian image of "natural" man as completely impotent still held true of elected man. It was not confidence in man's ability to persevere that the Calvinists held, but confidence in the divine promise that the elect would persevere. The free will to totally succumb to evil was as denied to the elect as the free will to resist evil was denied to the reprobate.

Barret was not arguing in favor of a completely free system that would destroy predestination theology in its entirety. He did not claim that the elect could finally lose faith thereby forfeiting their salvation. His argument was that the elect could for a time totally lose faith.[109] That they would in fact repent and ultimately be saved, was due not to God's decree of election, as the Calvinists would have it understood, but to God's infallible foreknowledge of their repentance.

A major corollary of the Calvinist doctrine of perseverance was the Calvinist definition of true faith. To account for those who appeared to be elected, but did succumb

---

[109] Ibid., II, 240 and Porter, Reformation..., p. 370.

to temptation and sin, the Calvinists, like St. Bernard, claimed that any faith that failed, i.e., a "temporary faith," was feigned, hypocritical and entirely different from the legitimate thing.

> ...that temporary faith (which, according to St. Bernard, is feigned because it is temporary) is distinguished not in measures and degrees, but in the thing itself; and differs from that saving faith by which sinners possessing Christ are justified in the presence of God to eternity.[110]

In his old controversy with Chaderton (1581), Baro had argued against this position as had Harsnett in his 1584 sermon.[111] In his sermon Barret stated "there is no distinction in faith, but rather among believers."[112] Not only was temporary faith a true faith, but even an unformed faith (fides informis) partook of the nature of real faith.[113] The unformed faith, by assenting to good works affected the

---

[110]Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXII, 318. "...fidem temporariam (quae idcirco fieta est, teste Bernardo, quia temporaria) non mensura et gradibus sed reipsa distinqui, et differri a fide illa salutifera, qua peccatores Christum apprehendentes, coram Deo in aeternum justificantur."

[111]See page 58.

[112]Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXII, 318. "In fide nullam esse distinctionem affirmavi, sed in credentibus."

[113]He follows Acquinas here. (Summa II; Question 6, Article 2). See Porter, Reformation..., note p. 358.

will and thereby altered the quality of the faith.[114]

In so stating Barret not only attacked one of the major props of the Calvinist doctrine of the indefectibility of grace in the elect, but also attributed to the non-elect a measure of grace that was denied them by the determinism of Calvinistic predestination.

Although Saravia would not go along with Barret's position on the defectibility of grace in the elect, he did support Barret's position on the nature of faith. In arguing for the defectibility of faith Saravia spoke of the believer, not of the elect.[115] As with his support of Barret's notion of assurance he relied heavily upon Scriptural authority. If only those who necessarily persevered to the end (i.e., the elect) had true faith, it would be vain to urge perseverance upon any man. The elect would persevere without urging, and urging would serve no purpose for those who had no true faith. But in fact Scriptures did urge men to persevere.

> He promises the crown of eternal life to no man, except he shall have persevered to the end. Whence we can understand that not all who at one time began well are going to be perseverers.
>
> When twice the Lord said in Matthew,

---

[114]To Whitaker this meant that Barret taught "that good works are the fruit of faith, and so must be the formal cause thereof." Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 265.

[115]Ibid., II, 242.

> "Whosoever shall persevere till the end, he shall be saved: it is the same as if He had said that who should not persevere should not be saved.[116]

Although the question of assurance would not arise in the Dutch controversy, and Arminius would be noncommittal on the issue of perseverance, Barret's general position in many areas anticipated that of the Dutch Arminians. The distinction between absolute predestination and predestination based upon prescience, so prominent in Arminius's thought, was at least hinted at in Barret's emphasis upon total as opposed to final falling from grace. The doctrine of universal atonement through Christ, central to Arminian theology, was a natural consequence of Barret's definition of true faith. In fact immediately after the Whitgift-Barret meeting at Lambeth, Baro preached a sermon attacking the Calvinistic doctrine of limited atonement.[117]

The Dutch Arminian concern with free will in relation to both elect and reprobate, was also anticipated in the Cambridge dispute. Like Arminius, Barret and his supporters never went so far as to credit the elect with meriting their ultimate fate. They never rejected the traditional portrait of man as sinful by nature and deserving of reprobation.

---

[116] Ibid., III, Document XXIV, 324. "...nemini aeternae vitae coronam promittit, nisi qui usque ad finem perseverarit. Unde datur intelligi non omnes perseraturos, qui aliquando benè inceperint."

[117] See Chapter III of this study.

In fact it was the freedom to sin that the Cambridge "Arminians" sought to preserve for the elect as well as for the reprobate.

Although no constructive system comparable to that of Arminius was constructed by Barret, philosophically and theologically his sermon differed little from the later formulated Arminian viewpoint that "...grace does not force the man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted and rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner."[118] In 1610 the Dutch Remonstrance stated the position succinctly; in 1595 Barret used the same theology - unstated - to attack the Calvinist concepts of perseverance and assurance.

On reprobation, however, Barret's sermon statement was as clear and succinct as the Remonstrance.

> ...in respect to those who are not saved, I believe most firmly, and frankly profess myself to believe, against Calvin, P. Martyr, and the rest, that sin is the true, proper, and first cause of their rejection.[119]

Here, Barret, like Harsnett before him, made perfectly clear the anti-Calvin context of his position. As if doubtful of his own clarity, the young "heretic" went on to say

---

[118] Grand Remonstrance, Article IV. See Chapter I.

[119] Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXII, 318. "Quod ad eos attinet qui non servantur, firmissimè credo, et me sic credere ingenue profiteor, contra Calvinum, P. Martyrem, et reliquos, peccatum esse veram, propriam et primam causam reprobationis."

of Calvin, "He dares to raise himself above the most high and omnipotent Father, indeed above the most high and omnipotent Son."[120] Furthermore he spoke out bitterly against P. Martyr, Theodore Beza, Jerome Zanchius, and Francis Junius "calling them Calvinists as a hateful name, and other ignominious expressions..."[121]

Later, in reply to the eighth of Whitaker's questions, Barret attempted to justify his attack on the basis that it had not been personal, but doctrinal.

> ...because they brought in some errors into the Church of God, and defended them, being brought in; therefore I, a student of true and catholic doctrine, and doing the office of a Preacher, the reason of my office required that I should confute them.[122]

To the Calvinist Heads, Barret's self defense was but one more bit of heresy. According to their understanding, not their views, but Barret's own, introduced theological novelties into the Church of England. In their June letter to Whitgift the Calvinist Heads had charged that Barret's views were "contrary to the doctrine of the nature, quality, and condition of faith, set forth in the Articles of Religion and Homilies... that had been taught ever since her

---

[120] Ibid., III, 319. "...eum nimirum ausum fuisse sese attollere supra altissimi et omnipotentis Dei verè altissimum et omnipotentem Filium."

[121] Ibid. "...eos odioso nomine apellans Calvinistas, et aliis verbis ignominiae..."

[122] Quoted in ibid., II, 264.

Majesty's reign, in sermons, and defended in the public schools, and open commencements, without contradiction in the Universities..."[123] In July they toned down their charge. Barret's position was contradictory to the doctrine "generally received, taught, and defended in that University, ...since the beginning of her Majesty's reign..."[124] It seems, however, that by September the Heads wished to retract their "concession" to Barret, for they again maintained that Barret had spoken "contrary to the doctrine of our Church set down in the book of Articles, in the Apology of the Church of England, and in Defence of the same, in Catechisms commanded by authority to be used, and in the Book of Common Prayer."[125]

In their efforts to overwhelm Barret and his supporters, the Calvinists came to attack (by denial) the moderate Elizabethan position on predestination, the official representative of which was Archbishop Whitgift.

The Archbishop was neither adept nor interested in the theological points at issue. He complained to Matthew Hutton that men were now concerned with issues that "were

---

[123]Quoted in ibid., II, 233. Letter of June 12, 1595.

[124]Quoted in ibid., II, 249-50. Whitaker's September letter to Whitgift openly acknowledged the change in the Heads' charge. "...Mr. Barret hath taught untruth, if not against the Articles, yet against the religion of our Church, publicly received, and always held in her Majesties reign..." Ibid., III, Document XXV.

[125]Quoted in ibid., II, 262.

never doubted by any Professor of the Gospel during all the time of your abode and mine in the university."[126] But it was not simply a matter of a "generation gap." Whitgift, by nature, was not inclined to theological controversy. As early as the Travers-Hooker engagement, he had avoided the theological conflict with the Calvinists by silencing Travers with the tool of an administrator rather than of a theologian (i.e., charging him with ordinational, not theological, fault). Had it been possible, he would have avoided indulging in theological speculation in 1595. Unfortunately, the threat posed by both Barret and the Calvinists to the Elizabethan policy of comprehension by moderation, forced Whitgift to overcome his "usuall prudence."[127]

Forced to speak out, Whitgift attempted to maintain the flexible character of the Elizabethan Church. Early in the controversy he attempted to enforce the comprehensive policy against the narrow parochialism of the Heads. When they complained of finding "popish" books in the rooms of many students,[128] Whitgift wrote to the Heads:

---

[126] Quoted in Dawley, p. 221.

[127] Philip Warwick, Memoirs of the Reign of Charles I... With a Continuation to the Happy Restauration of King Charles II (London, 1703), p. 86; Dawley, 219ff; and Brook, pp. 107ff.

[128] Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 235. Letter of June 12, 1595.

> ...all books of English fugitives were simply forbid; and so were all other Popish books containing matter against this State. And that otherwise, he know no reason why students might not have in their studies other books writ by Papists, as ever hitherto.[129]

On the same basis, i.e., Elizabethan comprehensiveness, Whitgift tended to argue for toleration of the specific views Barret had expressed in his sermon. His criteria for tolerable religious opinions were: (1) the opinion did no violence to the Articles of Religion and/or (2) the opinion involved "matters disputable" within the English Church.[130]

On the distinction between *securitas* and *certitudo* Whitgift came out in full support of young Barret.

> To what article of religion established in this Church it was contrary, he saw not: seeing *security* was never taken in good part: neither did Scripture so use it. And what impiety was it to affirm that a man ought to be *certus de salute*.[131]

In fact, Whitgift, having given an oration on the subject

---

[129]Quoted in *ibid.*, II, 239. Letter of June 19, 1595.

[130]Contrary to the Calvinists who considered all the points at issue as clear and fundamental breaches of doctrine, Whitgift claimed "...that some of the points wherewith they had charged him, [Barret] and which they had caused him to recant...were such as the best learned Protestants, then living, varied in judgment upon." Quoted in *ibid.*, II, 258. July letter to Burghley.

[131]Quoted in *ibid.*, II, 230. Letter of June 19 to Heads.

of security twenty years before,[132] seemed inclined to favor rather than simply to tolerate Barret's distinction. On this particular point Barret was supported by the moderate tradition of predestination theology. In asserting that God's decrees were "by his counsel secret to us," Article XVII of the Thirty-nine would seem to favor "insecurity" and "uncertainty" over their opposites.

Into the category of "matters disputable" Whitgift put Barret's attacks on the Scriptural props the Calvinists used for their doctrines of assurance and perseverance. The question of Paul's assurance, (Romans 8:38), i.e., "whether it was private and extraordinary," could be answered "pro et con without impiety." At most Whitgift would have Barret "be instructed by some that varied in opinion from him."[133] As for the verse in Luke (12:32) - "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" - Whitgift held that it clearly could not be drawn to all the elect. At most it could refer to all the apostles rather than to Peter alone. And even here "men might...without impiety, vary in opinion."[134]

---

[132]Whitgift, III, 622-23.

[133]Quoted in Strypo, The Life and Acts..., II, 270.

[134]Quoted in ibid., II, 269. Whitgift's support in this case was not for Barret's position on the perseverance of the elect. It was only support for Barret's interpretation of the Lucan verse. The Calvinist error was not in theology, but in Scriptural interpretation. Instead of Luke 12:32, they should have supported their doctrine with John

Only in two areas did Whitgift find fault with Barret's assertions. In both cases Barret had moved closer to the Roman concept of good works than the English Archbishop would allow.

The first objection was to Barret's position on the nature of faith. Whitgift did not agree with the statement that there was no distinction in faith, but in believers. Nevertheless, since the statement in no way violated any article, the error was venial, "worthy of reprehension, not of recantation."[135] Whitgift responded more strongly to Barret's inclusion of fides informis (unformed faith) in the category of true faith. Agreeing with Whitaker, Whitgift found Barret's position popish, and contradictory to the doctrine of justification by faith (as opposed to good works).

The second objection was to Barret's assertion that remission of sins was dependent on penitential acts. But here again Whitgift charged the Heads with over-reaction. The Archbishop's own censure of Barret stated he "showed therein his ignorance. Wherein he should have been better instructed..."[136]

The few criticisms appear even more minor when compared

17:20 - "I do not pray for these only, but also for those who believe in me through their word."

[135] Quoted in ibid., II, 240.

[136] Ibid.

to the Archbishop's support of Barret's attacks on the Calvinistic concept of reprobation and the infallibility of the Genevan reformers.

On the issue of reprobation Whitgift's support of Barret was so forceful that it made further effort to implement the Calvinist doctrine impossible.

> For the Scriptures were plain, that God by his absolute will did not hate and reject any man, without an eye to his sin. There might be impiety in believing the one, there could be none in believing the other. Neither was it contrary to any article of religion, established by authority in this Church of England; but rather agreeable thereunto.[137]

As for the reverence due the Genevan reformers, Whitgift's opinion in 1595 did not differ from the view he had expressed in the 1570's.

> I reverence M. Calvin as a singular man, and worthy instrument in Christ's Church; but I am not so wholly addicted unto him, that I will condemn other men's judgments that in divers points agree not fully with him, especially in the interpretation of some places of the scripture, when, as, in my opinion, they come nearer to the true meaning and sense of it in those points than he doth.[138]

Elaborating further in 1595, Whitgift claimed in respect to

---

[137] Ibid. As a result, Whitaker's eight questions contained no direct reference to reprobation irrespective of sin.

[138] Whitgift, I, 436.

Calvin and Beza that the "doctrine of the Church of England did in no respect depend upon them." Moreover he took the opportunity to point out that Calvin had been neither infallible, nor a constant friend of the English Church. He had censured Henry VIII, the founder of the Church of England, and had frequently reproved that church. Even when lightly scolding Barret for naming Calvin and Beza "to their reproach," Whitgift felt it necessary to again mention the historical relationship between Geneva and the English Church.

> ...errors might be confuted without naming of the persons to their discredit; especially such as had laboured in the Church, and that did concur with us in the chief and principal points of religion. Notwithstanding, we had been little beholden to some of them, who rashly and uncharitably had believed some reports of this government, and took upon them to censure us in books printed.[139]

More important, Whitgift took the opportunity to reaffirm the independence of the Elizabethan Church from both Rome and Geneva. Both had contributed greatly to Christian teaching, but the "fathers" of one were not superior to the other, and neither were infallible. Referring to the Geneva fathers he wrote:

> But we must take heed,...that their bare names and authorities carried not men too far, as to believe their

---

[139]Quoted in Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 271.

> errors, or to yield unto them that honour of forbearance of reproof, which was not yielded to any of the ancient Fathers.[140]

Despite his affinity with Barret's positions on assurance, reprobation and the fallibility of Geneva, Whitgift pushed through a second document of recantation for Barret that affirmed some of the very opinions that Whitgift had claimed to be "disputable." This recantation denied and retracted the following: (1) A temporary faith is all one with a saving faith; (2) There is no distinction in faith; (3) None can be certain of his salvation by a certainty of faith; (4) That remission of sins is not special of this or that person; (5) Peter's faith only could not fail; (6) Christ prayed for Peter's faith only; (7) David knew not that he could not fall away; (8) The gift of perseverance is a future contingent.[141]

Although Whitgift had not found Barret much to his personal liking when they met at Lambeth, this fact alone would not account for the drastic switch in his approach to the Cambridge disputants. As a theological moderate, and an Elizabethan churchman of the highest order, Whitgift quite reasonably could advocate toleration of Barret's views. Within the broad theological spectrum of the Elizabethan Church, Barret's statements were tolerable as privately held

---

[140] Quoted in ibid.

[141] Ibid., II, 274.

opinions. But Whitgift was called upon to do more than act as arbiter in a quarrel over privately held opinions. The Calvinists did not express their opinions qua opinions, but rather as the only acceptable interpretation of the doctrine of the Church of England. It was on this premise that they based their efforts to suppress Barret. In order to do so they found it necessary to attack and deny not only the anti-Calvinist theology of predestination, but also the comprehensive Elizabethan tradition that had been maintained by keeping a public silence on questions involving predestination.

> To forbid Preachers, Readers, and all Divines to deal in these causes; ...And by this means to bring in either an alteration of doctrine in these points, or an universal silence therein, we take to be not only a hard matter, but altogether impossible....
>
> If the doctrine that hath always since the Reformation been received and allowed, begin now in these points, not only to be brought into question, but by authority either charged as untrue, or suppressed as dangerous or unprofitable; what may the Papists think of the whole substance of our religions![142]

Consequently, Whitgift was faced with a major attack on Elizabethan policy. In order to head off this attack, Whitgift, in spite of his theological inclinations, had to compromise with the Calvinists. That he had to do so

---

[142] Ibid., II, 261.

testifies to the strength of the Calvinist party within the English Church. It is also an indication of the weakness of the anti-Calvinist forces, for if the "Arminians" had been as mature and strong as the Porter thesis would make them, Whitgift could have achieved peace within the University by using them as a buffer against the Calvinists.

However, more important than Whitgift's willingness to sacrifice Barret (which appears to have been a rather political move), was his willingness to break the Elizabethan silence on predestination with the promulgation of the Lambeth Articles.

C H A P T E R III

THE LAMBETH ARTICLES

The Barret controversy is historically significant as an indicator of an anti-Calvinist theology within the University. The immediate significance of the controversy, however, lay in the product of its resolution - the Lambeth Articles. These nine articles took the controversy over predestination theology outside of the narrow University context, and made it a national church issue.

Although the purpose of the Articles was to prevent another controversy over predestination, almost from the moment of their formulation the Articles themselves became a subject of controversy. However, unlike the Barret issue, this controversy was not resolved; and the Lambeth Articles became a crucial source of reference in the debate between Calvinists and Arminians during the 1620's.

Whitgift's original objection to the action taken against Barret had been based upon concern for the usurpation of his own prerogative. Though the Archbishop soon became involved in the theological issues, he never lost sight of the administrative aspect of the controversy. As early as July 11, 1595 he had written the Vice-chancellor and Heads:

> I pray you to take care that

> hereafter the pulpit nor any other places, be used in these controversies; until such time as you shall receive some resolutions from hence in these causes, which had been ere this, if your hasty proceedings had not ministered occasion to the contrary.[1]

On September 30 he urged the Heads "to give strait and earnest charge, that no man in pulpit within the University should deal in these causes, to or fro, until further order were taken."[2]

At the Lambeth meeting in November the promised resolutions were formally drafted. The participants in this meeting included Whitaker, and Humphrey Tyndal, Dean of Ely, representing the University, Richard Vaughan, Bishop elect of Bangor, and Richard Fletcher, Bishop of London.[3]

---

[1]Quoted in Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 251.

[2]Quoted in ibid., II, 268.

[3]These four are specifically mentioned by Porter (Reformation..., p. 365), Heylyn (Aerius Redivivus..., p. 343), and Collier (VII, 185). They all mention the presence of others, but do not name them. Strype names specifically only the two University representatives (The Life and Acts..., II, 279). Thomas Fuller (The Church History of Britain, from the Birth of Jesus Christ Until the Year 1648, ed. J.S. Brewer [Oxford, 1845], V, 219) says that Bancroft, Bishop of London was present, but as he does not mention Fletcher, it would appear that he confused Bancroft with Fletcher. The latter was Bishop of London until 1596; and Bancroft succeeded him in 1597. Charles Hardwick's claim that "they were all, so far as we are able to determine, of the school from whose conclusions Barret and the Margaret Professor had both ventured to dissent...." (A History of the Articles of Religion [London, 1890], p. 174), is highly questionable. There is no evidence of strong Calvinistic sympathies on the part of either Vaughan or Fletcher. In fact Fletcher named as executor of his

Although the Lambeth meeting was called by Whitgift, the original draft of the resolutions was drawn up by Whitaker and submitted to Whitgift on the tenth of November.[4] Between the tenth and the twentieth of November the Whitaker draft was altered by Whitgift, and a final draft of nine articles was agreed upon.[5]

The Lambeth Articles, as the propositions came to be called, were sent back to the University in manuscript form. With them went a covering letter in which Whitgift directed "that nothing should be publicly taught to the contrary." But "also in teaching them, discretion and

---

estate his "good and lovinge freindes Mr. Doctor Bancrofte and Mr. Doctor Cosen" both of whom were opponents of the Calvinists. (See Cooper & Cooper, II, 207, 450-51).

[4]The date is given in Heylyn, Historia Quinquarticularis..., Part III, p. 77. In his article on the Lambeth meeting W.D. Sargeaunt emphasizes the importance of Whitgift taking the initiative in calling the meeting. By so doing he limited the theological scope of any resolutions that might be forthcoming from the meeting. Sargeaunt also infers from the fact that the Cambridge men were sent at the Archbishop's "advice," that Whitgift had directed Whitaker to draft the Articles. (Sargeaunt, p. 260). Hardwick, following Heylyn (Historia Quinquarticularis..., Part III, p. 77), implies that Whitaker took it upon himself to make the original draft of the Articles (p. 172). The limited scope of the Whitaker proposals, particularly in regard to the term "securos," would indicate that Whitaker, even if not asked to draft the proposals, was well aware that Whitgift was in control at this conference, and would require some compromise on the part of the Calvinists.

[5]Collier (VII, 185) dates the beginning of the Conference from the tenth when Whitgift received Whitaker's draft. Strype notes that it ended on the twentieth of November (The Life and Acts..., II, 279).

moderation should be used; that such as should be in some points differing in judgment, might not be of purpose stung, or justly grieved. And especially, that no bitterness, contention, or personal reproof or reproaches should be used by any towards any."[6] Whitgift's motives were quite clear. He had broken the Elizabethan silence on predestination in order "to have the peace of the Church generally observed in all places, and especially in that University..."[7]

The letter also attempted to clarify the status of the Articles

> ...the propositions nevertheless must be taken and used as their private judgments; thinking them to be true, and correspondent to the doctrine professed in the Church of England, and established by the laws of the Land: and not as laws and decrees.[8]

Nevertheless, almost immediately there arose questions as to the authority of the Articles. By some they were regarded as authoritative, almost equal in "their authenticalness with the acts of a synod..."[9] Others claimed that the participants in the conference had no official standing, and therefore their determinations, though useful as general

---

[6]Whitgift to Heads, November 24, 1595. Quoted in Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 282.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Fuller, The Church History..., V, 223. See also Paul A. Welsby, Lancelot Andrewes, 1555-1626 (London, 1959), p. 45.

guidelines, were not enforceable. A third group thought the members "deserved censure for holding an unlawful conventicle," to which members of the anti-Calvinist party had not been "solemnly summoned and heard; so that it might seem rather a design to crush them than to clear the truth."[10]

Unfortunately for Whitgift, the Queen was one of those who thought the participants in the conference, in particular Whitgift, had overstepped their authority. Informed of the meeting and its resolutions by Chancellor Burghley (who had received his information from Whitaker), the Queen readily had Burghley communicate her displeasure to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

> ...she misliked much that any allowance had been given by his Grace and the rest, of any such points to be disputed: being a matter tender and dangerous to weak ignorant minds. And thereupon that she required his Grace to suspend them.[11]

Porter claims that Elizabeth's reaction to the Articles was based upon her misconception that Whitgift meant to have them widely published and openly disputed.[12] He bases this claim upon the assumption that Elizabeth could hardly have been referring to the Cambridge dons with the phrase "weak

---

[10]Fuller, The Church History..., V, 224.

[11]Letter of Cecil to Whitgift, December 5, 1595. Quoted in Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 286.

[12]Reformation..., p. 374 and "The Anglicanism of Archbishop Whitgift," p. 139.

ignorant minds." But Porter makes too much of a case out of the Queen's (or Cecil's) choice of language. In a letter to Nevile, Master of Trinity, Whitgift himself said that the Queen's displeasure was directed against having the Articles published and disputed within the University.[13] Moreover, it is quite conceivable that Elizabeth would discourage disputations on predestination even within the University. The phrase "weak ignorant minds" could well have been a reference to the frailty of the human mind in general. So interpreted, Elizabeth's response was the reassertion of her traditional policy of silence on mysteries that were by God's "counsel secret to us."

In the light of this interpretation of the royal will, Whitgift's protest that he had not sent the Articles to the University for disputation[14] was a poor defense indeed. Though they were intended to serve as policy guides, and not as subjects for debate, the admittedly private and unofficial status of the Articles would make them particularly open to disputation.

Interpretations of the Queen's reasoning aside, most historians agree that Elizabeth had the Articles suppressed. The most notable exception is Fuller who denied any record of Elizabeth's displeasure at the Articles. Citing Montague's

---

[13]Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 284.

[14]Ibid.

assertion that the Articles were "afterward forbidden by public authority,"[15] Fuller commented "...strange it is, that a public prohibition should be whispered so softly, that this author alone should hear it, and none other to my knowledge take notice."[16] At the other extreme, the author of the first history of the Articles (Articuli Lambethani /1651/,[17] and Peter Heylyn[18] claimed that Elizabeth would have ordered the Lambeth divines prosecuted for offending against the statute of praemunire had it not been for the mediation of some of Whitgift's friends.

There is little question about the Calvinistic character of the articles submitted by Whitaker.[19] The character of the final draft of the Lambeth Articles, however, has been a debated point. There are three schools of thought on the theological nature of the Articles: (1) They were Calvin-

---

[15] Richard Montague, Appello Caesarem: A Just Appeale from Two Unjust Informers (London, 1625), pp. 55-56, 71-72.

[16] Fuller, The Church History..., V, 225.

[17] Sargeaunt (p. 260) identifies the author as F.G. Sancti Nicolai apud Tinobantes Minister.

[18] Aerius Redivivus..., p. 344.

[19] See Appendix II. Porter has noted that Whitaker's draft was not so extreme as it might have been. Article IV stated that the reprobate are condemned "on account of their sins," and Article VI on assurance made no mention of securos ("The Anglicanism of Archbishop Whitgift," p. 140). Some exception may be taken to Porter's first example; the Calvinist could and did argue that although the reprobate are damned because of their sins, the fact of their being "the reprobate" was due not to their sins, but to God's decree.

istic, and contrary in spirit and letter to the Thirty-nine Articles; (2) They were a continuation of the Calvinistic tradition of the Thirty-nine Articles; (3) They represented a continuation of the non-Calvinistic, general tone of the Thirty-nine Articles.

The first school of thought includes such historians as Peter Heylyn, P.M. Dawley, Samuel R. Gardiner, M. Knappen, Charles Hardwick, E.J. Bicknell, and V.H.H. Green. Of these historians Heylyn has taken the most extreme position. He claimed that the Articles "were so contrived, that both the Sabbatarians, and the supra-lapsarians...might be sheltered under them."[20] Despite his interpretation of the Lambeth Articles as "full-blown" Calvinism, Heylyn was unwilling to portray Whitgift as a Calvinist in Anglican dress. In defense of the Archbishop, Heylyn argued for the political expediency of the compromise with the Calvinists. Whitgift did not really like the Articles; he agreed to them only out of a peculiar sort of administrative short-sightedness, preferring "the pacifying of some present Dissenters, before the apprehension of such Inconveniences as were more remote..."[21] As evidence of Whitgift's good intentions, Heylyn cited his recommendation for the advancement in the church hierarchy of such an anti-Calvinist as Samuel

---

[20]Heylyn, Aerius Redivivus..., p. 344.

[21]Ibid., p. 345.

Harsnett.[22]

With the exception of P.M. Dawley,[23] the major historians of this school - Samuel R. Gardiner,[24] M. Knappen,[25] and Charles Hardwick[26] - all share Heylyn's view of the Articles, but blame Whitgift for attempting "to saddle high Calvinism upon the established church."[27]

The second school of historians which views the Articles as well within the Anglican Church tradition is represented by Philip Hughes and Philip Schaff. They do not deny the Calvinism of the Lambeth Articles; but assert that such Calvinism had been the norm in the English Church since its reformation. Consequently the new Articles are seen as a legitimate development of traditional Calvinistic English theology.[28]

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] Dawley follows Heylyn's interpretation both in terms of the Articles, and Whitgift's role in their formulation. (Dawley, pp. 212-13).

[24] Samuel R. Gardiner, The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-42 (London, 1884-86), I, 53.

[25] Knappen, pp. 369-70.

[26] Hardwick, p. 175.

[27] Knappen, p. 370. Though not commenting upon Whitgift's role, E.J. Bicknell (p. 17), Benjamin Warfield (p. 69), and V.H.H. Green (Religion at Oxford and Cambridge /London, 1964/, p. 123) are among the modern historians who see the Articles as embodying a Calvinist theology.

[28] Hughes, III, 231 and Schaff, I, 637.

More recently a school of thought has developed that asserts the non-Calvinistic character of English church doctrine, and views the Lambeth Articles as a continuation of that character. This school includes H.C. Porter, V.J.K. Brook, and W.D. Sargeaunt.[29] These historians do not deny that Whitgift had to compromise with the Calvinists, but they claim that the compromise was in the direction of a deliberate vagueness of language (a traditional Elizabethan strategy) that made the Articles susceptible to a diversity of interpretations. For example Brook notes that the first article "might be interpreted to mean no more than His /God's/ resolve that believers should be saved and non-believers lost, as classes."[30]

While Brook and Porter tend to stress the compromising aspect of the Articles, Sargeaunt, taking a more daring position, claims that "the Lambeth Articles are a statement of what must be conceded to the Heads of Houses... no more was conceded than the Archbishop guided by the Book of Articles was bound to concede."[31] Through a series of theological gymnastics, Sargeaunt attempts to show that none of the Calvinistic doctrines in question, i.e., absolute reprobation and predestination, assurance of

---

[29]Porter, Reformation..., pp. 364-75; Brook, pp. 163-65; Sargeaunt, pp. 251-60 and 427-36.

[30]Brook, p. 163.

[31]Sargeaunt, p. 436.

remission of sins and salvation, and the indefectibility of justifying faith, are to be found in the Articles.[32]

Close examination of the Articles does not support the extreme positions of either Heylyn or of Sargeaunt.[33] The Articles neither give expression to full-blown Calvinism, nor are they a natural consequence of Anglican thinking on predestination. Moreover the language is not so vague as to support Porter and Brook's theory of a genuine compromise. First of all, the very fact that the Archbishop was willing to "speak out," and even unofficially elaborate a theology of predestination was to the favor of the Calvinists. Secondly, if in fact there was a compromise, it was a compromise that worked only to replace a strong Calvinist theology with a weaker one. In both substance and tone the Lambeth Articles went beyond the Thirty-nine Articles.

Article I, unlike the seventeenth article of the Thirty-nine, stated the fact of reprobation as well as of election.

> God from eternity has predestined some men to life, and reprobated

---

[32] In his glosses on Articles III, IV, and V, Sargeaunt attributes to Whitgift and the Lambeth theologians an "Arminian-like" stress on God's prescience as the basis for the decrees of election and reprobation (pp. 430-32).

[33] On the basis of my discussion of the Thirty-nine Articles in Chapter I, I reject, without further comment, the theory that the Articles were a continuation of a Calvinistic tradition as expressed in the Thirty-nine Articles.

some to death.[34]

Clearly toned down from the Whitaker draft which would have asserted absolute and irrespective predestination,[35] Article II still lacked the softening "Christ" theme dominant in the seventeenth article of the Thirty-nine.

> The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not the foreseeing of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything innate in the person of the predestinated, but only the will of the good pleasure of God.

In spite of the change from Whitaker's "absolute and simple will of God" to "the will of the good pleasure of God,"[36] the emphasis was on God's "will" rather than on God's "mercy in Christ." As a result, the difference in tone between this Lambeth article and the seventeenth of the Thirty-nine Articles lay in the direction of the Calvinistic stress upon the blind justice of an omnipotent God.

Articles III and IV are susceptible to both a Calvinistic and a more liberal interpretation.

> There is a determined and certain number of predestined, which cannot be increased or diminished.
>
> Those not predestined to salvation

---

[34]The translation of the Lambeth Articles used here is that of Porter, Reformation..., pp. 365-66.

[35]See Appendix II.

[36]Porter (Reformation..., p. 369) describes this change as a move from Calvinistic to Paulistic language.

> are inevitably condemned on account of their sins.

The assertion of an absolute and determined number of elect could be understood either as an affirmation of the absoluteness of God's decree, or as an affirmation of the absolute infallibility of God's foreknowledge upon which the decree was based.

The inevitable damnation of the reprobate "on account of their sins" could be interpreted in terms of a distinction between the decree of reprobation and its execution, i.e., damnation. The reprobate were recipients of the decree of reprobation on account of God's absolute will, but the decree was actually executed on account of their sins. But the article could also be understood as an explanation of the workings of the divine decree, i.e., God foreknew the sins of the condemned, and therefore set them among the reprobate.

Even if the Archbishop had the more liberal interpretations of these two articles in mind, the need to elaborate on predestination theology without explicitly stating the liberal interpretation, was itself a concession to the Calvinists who, as past experience had demonstrated, welcomed any elaboration that would open the door to their interpretations.

The fifth article involved a compromise on the doctrine of assurance or indefectibility of faith. Whitaker would

have had it set forth the Calvinist position in full: justifying faith is not lost either totally or finally in those who have once had it. The compromise involved replacing "in those who once have been partakers of it" with "in the elect." The article thus read:

> A true, lively and justifying faith,
> and the sanctifying spirit of God,
> is not lost, nor does it pass away
> either totally or finally in those
> who once have been partakers of it.

Porter interprets this compromise as a concession to Barret's assertion that others besides the elect may, for a time, have true faith.[37] But this concession on the point of "temporary faith" was small compared to Whitgift's concession in terms of "totally or finally."

In his comments on Barret's recantation Whitgift had held that the belief that faith might fail totally, but not finally, was a matter disputable and against no article in the English creed.[38] At Lambeth he clearly conceded to the Calvinists, making way for a Calvinistic denial of free will in the elect.[39]

---

[37] Ibid., p. 370

[38] Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 240.

[39] Elizabethan tradition had denied that the elect did anything to warrant their election, whereas the reprobate did deserve their damnation. But Elizabethan theology had not asserted the indefectibility of the faith of the elect. Article sixteen of the Thirty-nine stated that "We may depart from grace given andfall into sin, and by the grace of God, we may arise again and amend our lives."

Article VI - on assurance - was the single example of a major concession on the part of the Calvinists.

> The truly faithful man - that is, one endowed with justifying faith - is sure by full assurance of faith of the remission of his sins and his eternal salvation through Christ.

Not only was the term "securos" absent, but the Pauline phrase "plerophoria fidei" (full assurance of faith) replaced the Calvinistic terminology "certitudine fidei" (certainty of faith). The term "certus" (sure, certain) remained. Whether it was to be understood in the Barret sense of conditional as opposed to categorical certainty, (a sense that Whitgift had found acceptable), or in a more Calvinistic sense, was not clarified.

The last three articles in essence took back whatever had been granted in Article IV. They were clear affirmations of the impotence of the human will, the limitations of the atonement of Christ, and the blind irrespectibility of the decrees of election and reprobation.

> Saving grace is not granted, not made common, not ceded to all men, by which they might be saved, if they wish.
>
> No one can come to Christ unless it be granted to him, and unless the Father draws him; and all men are not drawn by the Father to come to the Son.
>
> It is not in the will or the power of each and every man to be saved.

Nowhere in these articles was the sin of those not saved

mentioned. It was the decree, not man's own infidelity, that condemned the reprobate. It was the decree, not God's all-encompassing mercy through Christ, that saved the elect.

Sargeaunt attempts to explain away the Calvinistic tone of these articles with the claim that since Whitgift had limited discussion of irrespective reprobation, the articles were to be understood in terms of a contrast not between the elect and the reprobate, but between the faithful and the pagan.[40] The basis for this thesis lies only in his own assertion that Whitgift had "pronounced that the doctrine of irrespective reprobation was false."[41] There is no record of such a pronouncement at Lambeth. And Whitgift's previous statement to that effect[42] cannot be regarded as binding in the light of the Archbishop's change in at least one other major issue - that of perseverance.

Careful reading of the Articles without any predisposed inclination to justify Whitgift indicates that on the whole the Articles lent support to a watered-down Calvinistic theology of predestination. Indeed there was a compromise. But it did not involve the anti-Calvinist opinions expressed in the University dispute, or even the views of the more liberal Elizabethan theologians. The subject of the compro-

---

[40] Sargeaunt, pp. 453 ff.

[41] Ibid., p. 453.

[42] See Whitgift's letter to the Heads, June 19, 1595. Quoted on p. 86 of this study.

mise was the original Whitaker draft. The final draft represented only a vaguer and a less forceful statement than the Calvinists would have preferred. The very vagueness of language which historians such as Brook have applauded as genuine compromise, ultimately was favorable to the Calvinists. If the Calvinist position was not to be stated in full force, the vaguer the language, the more likely a narrow Calvinistic interpretation could be imposed upon its meaning.

Moreover, any statement on predestination, so long as it was not in direct contradiction to the Calvinist position, was better than the limited statements of the Thirty-nine Articles. And in fact the Lambeth Articles did "give" the Calvinists more than the Thirty-nine Articles had provided. The Calvinist doctrines of perseverance and indefectible grace certainly found more support in the fifth Lambeth article than in the sixteenth article of the Thirty-nine Articles. Even the Pauline statement on assurance in Article VI was more than had been said on the subject in the Thirty-nine Articles. Most important, a theology of reprobation, so glaringly absent from the earlier Elizabethan Articles, was the subject of three, if not four, of the nine Lambeth Articles.

Consequently, the Calvinists could only gain from the Lambeth compromise. Nothing of their doctrine was condemned or denied. And what was left unsaid on predestination in

1595 already had been left unsaid in the Elizabethan Articles of 1571.

Recognizing this, the Puritans attempted to have the Lambeth Articles officially incorporated into the Thirty-nine at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. If the language of the Lambeth Articles is not sufficient argument for their Calvinistic character, this fact certainly should be. It was not Elizabeth, nor James, nor their churchmen, but the Puritan Calvinist who in later years would acclaim the work of the Lambeth theologians.

English churchmen did not wait until 1604 and the Hampton Conference to respond to and comment upon the Lambeth Articles. The Bishops of York and of Rochester both wrote Whitgift of their concurrence with the Articles.[43]

Nevertheless the Articles "occasioned much talk and resentment to many."[44] The concerned Whitgift turned to Matthew Hutton of York who responded directly to Whitgift's request for specific alterations that would make the Articles more acceptable. Hutton tended to defend the Articles as agreeable to the teachings of Saint Augustine. The only

---

[43]Young of Rochester noted that he had doubts about the fourth article - "Those not predestined to salvation are inevitably condemned on account of their sins" - but modestly claimed that the doubts could be due to his own lack of understanding. (Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 281). See Thomas Fuller (The Church History..., V, 222-23) for the letter from Matthew Hutton of York.

[44]Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 314.

alterations he suggested were (1) the deletion of the word "necessario" (inevitably) from Article IV; (2) the addition of the words "secundum propositum vocatus" ("called according to divine decree") to Article VI; (3) the deletion of "si voluerint" ("if they will") from Article VII; and (4) the complete omission of Article VIII as repetitious of the previous article.[45]

Two of these changes - those involving Articles IV and VII - would make, by Hutton's own admission, the said articles "less offensive" ("minus offenderet"). And by "less offensive" he could only have meant "less Calvinistic." The word "inevitably" certainly added a sense of doom and irreversibility to the fourth article, whereas the revised version - "Those not predestined to salvation are condemned on account of their sins" - at least left the door open for some theology of repentance.[46]

Hutton's second deletion changed the whole tone of Article VII. Without "if they will," the article could not be understood as a declaration of the impotence of the human will. If the word "granted" in the opening phrase

---

[45]See ibid., II, 218, 314 and Fuller, The Church History..., V, 222-23.

[46]Nevertheless, the change was advocated only for appeasement, for Hutton's recommendation to add "summoned according to decree," to Article VI precluded a theology of repentance. With Hutton's revision Article VI would affirm that even if the reprobate reformed their lives, if they had not been called, they could not be saved.

was not interpreted as "offered," the article read only as a statement of the fact that all men were not saved.

> Saving grace is not granted, is not made common, is not ceded to all men, by which they might be saved.

With this sense the Article VII is only a negative restatement of Article XVII of the Thirty-nine.

> ...He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind...

Thus, in spite of the fact that Hutton took the Articles "to be true, as they were penned at first,"[47] he recognized that it was the Calvinistic language that made them distasteful to some of the influential English churchmen.

Among these churchmen was the "judicious" Dr. Hooker. Hooker did not direct his attention specifically to the Lambeth conference and its work. His comments on the Articles consisted of the enumeration of nine parallel articles which in an indirect way were a critique of the Lambeth creation.

Hooker's articles appeared in a treatise described in the catalogue of the library of Trinity College, Dublin (MS B.1.13), where the manuscript is located, as "a Treatise by Hooker, on 'Grace, the Sacraments, Predestination, etc.'"[48] According to John Keble, editor of Hooker's Works, this

---

[47] Quoted in Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 314.

[48] Hooker, Preface, pp. xxv-xxvi.

treatise was to have formed part of an intended reply to an attack on Hooker entitled: "A Christian Letter of certaine English Protestants, unfained favoures of the present state of Religion, authorised and professed in England: unto that Roverend and learned man, Mr. R. Hoo. requiring resolution in certain matters of doctrine (which seeme to overthrow the foundation of Christian Religion, and of the Church among us) expresslie contained in his five books of Ecclesiastical Policie...1599."[49] The other part of Hooker's reply to the charges brought against him in the "Christian Letter" appear in his marginal comments upon that pamphlet which were entitled "Fragments of an Answer to the Letter..." In these comments Hooker presented his position on the questions that lay at the core of the predestination controversies at Cambridge in 1595 and after.

Hooker, like Arminius, was obsessed with the need to construct a theology of predestination that in no way set God at the source of human sinfulness. For both men, man's free will and God's foreknowledge became the cornerstones of predestination theology.

On free will Hooker adhered to the sublapsarian doctrine, describing Adam as a free agent whose fall, although foreknown, was in no way predestined. In succumbing to evil Adam destroyed man's liberty to do good as well as evil, but

---

[49] Ibid., p. xviii.

the "aptness" of man's will "to shun or follow, to choose or reject, any eligible object whatsoever" remained.[50] It was this "aptness" which made it possible for man to accept God's gift of grace through Christ.

> ...had aptness been also lost, it is not grace that could work in us more than it doth in brute creatures.[51]

Here Hooker differed slightly from Arminius's position on the effect of the Fall on the human will. According to Arminius, freedom of will was completely destroyed by original sin, and it was restored by Christ's sacrifice. For Hooker, man never lost his potential to choose good. Christ merely realized that potential with his gift of grace.

> Man hath still a reasonable understanding and a will thereby framable to good things, but is not thereunto now able to frame himself.[52]

Hooker also anticipated the Dutch theologian's views on reprobation. Just as Arminius would argue that God's justice could not do violence to man's lesser justice, so Hooker insisted that it was impossible that "God should will any thing unjust, or unreasonable, anything against those very rules whereby himself hath taught us to judge what equity requireth: for out of all peradventure there are no

---

[50] Ibid., II, 537.

[51] Ibid., II, 538.

[52] Ibid., II, 539.

antinomies with God."[53] Consequently Hooker's theology of predestination grounded the decree of reprobation in God's prescience of man's choices.

> Wherefore, as all men of knowledge grant, that God is himself no author of sin; so no man will deny, but that God is able to foresee and foretell what sin, as what righteousness either may be, or will be in men, and that consequently there are many things in his sight certain to be brought to pass, which himself did never foreordain.[54]

In no way did the divine prescience of sin necessitate that sin. God willed that all men were "capable of inward grace"[55] and consequently of salvation. But because God foreknew that there would be men who would resist the grace offered, there grew from God a secondary kind of will that decreed the reprobation of such men.

> ...condemnation is not the end wherefore God did create any man, although it be an event or consequent which man's unrighteousness causeth God to decree.
>
> The place of Judas was _locus suus_, a place of his own proper procurement. Devils were not ordained of God for hell-fire, but hell-fire for them; and for men, so far as it was foreseen, that men would be like them.[56]

---

[53] _Ibid._, II, 563.

[54] _Ibid._

[55] _Ibid._, II, 590.

[56] _Ibid._, II, 575.

Hooker's "Articles" were a reflection of the above summarized theology of predestination. In general they involved a level of specification that greatly limited the possibility of any Calvinistic interpretation. In particular, they involved the omission of sections dealing with reprobation, and the insertion of phrases and statements supportive of Hooker's emphasis on prescience and free will.

Unlike the first of the Lambeth Articles which affirmed both election and reprobation, Hooker's first article dealt only with election.

> That God hath predestined certain men, not all men.[57]

Although Hooker retained in a general way the first half of the second Lambeth article, he completely deleted the words denoting that the sole cause of election was "the will of the good pleasure of God." In so doing Hooker completely altered the mood, if not the substance of the article. The Lambeth article was constructed so as to set up a dichotomy between election grounded in divine foreknowledge of human virtue and election grounded in the self-contained will of God. Hooker could agree with the Lambeth position that man was in no way deserving of election and salvation; but he could not go along with the dichotomy within the second article. It was not God's will, but his mercy

---

[57] Ibid., II, 596.

that Hooker, like Champneys before him,[58] saw as the basis for election. Divine will was the major theme in the Calvinistic theology of election; divine mercy, the major theme in the election theology of the Thirty-nine Articles. Consequently Hooker's second article simply stated: "That the cause, moving him hereunto, was not the foresight of any virtue in us at all."[59]

Hooker was not in disagreement with either Article III or IV. But he did wish to avoid the possibilities of any Calvinistic interpretation or overtones in these articles. The specificity of his version of Article III - "That to him the number of his elect is definitely known"[60] - eliminated the possibility of an interpretation that would attribute the set number of elect to the absolute nature of God's will. The Hooker wording of Article IV completely removed the concept of an absolute will and decree from the theology of both election and reprobation.

> That it cannot be but their sins must condemn them, to whom the purpose of his saving mercy doth not extend.[61]

Hooker's fifth article affirmed Barret's positions that (1) the elect could fall from grace totally, but not

---

[58] See Chapter II, p. 44

[59] Hooker, II, 596.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Ibid.

finally and (2) that true faith once granted was not indefectible. He accomplished the first by omitting the word "total," and the second, by specifying "the elect."

> That to God's foreknown elect final continuance of grace is given.[62]

In fact Hooker's concept of baptism was in complete agreement with Barret's assertion that the non-elect could have had true faith, i.e., that temporary faith was true faith. According to Hooker, baptism conferred grace and faith upon the recipient, and the fate of that grace and faith depended only upon the free will of the recipient.

The sixth article, covering assurance of remission of sins and assurance of salvation, was completely omitted in the Hooker version.

Into Article VII Hooker inserted the word "deservedly" to counteract any notion of arbitrary punishment. It read

> That inward grace, whereby to be saved, is deservedly not given unto all men.[63]

Like Champneys and Harsnett,[64] Hooker desired to set his theology of predestination between the "Scylla and Charybdis" of Pelagianism and Calvinism. He used his revision of the last two articles for this purpose.

Whereas the Lambeth rendition of these articles put

---

[62] Ibid.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Chapter II, pp.

the stress upon limited election, Hooker's articles could be interpreted only as affirmations of the impossibility of man attaining salvation on his own.

> That no man cometh unto Christ, whom God, by the inward grace of his Spirit draweth not.
>
> That it is not in every, no not in any man's own mere ability, freedom and power to be saved; no man's salvation being possible without grace.

But even in the midst of cautioning against the Pelagian errors, Hooker did not fail to point again to the errors of the opposite extreme. He closed his articles with:

> Howbeit God is no favourer of sloth, and therefore there can be no such absolute decree, touching man's salvation as on our part includeth no necessity of care and travail, but shall certainly take effect, whether we ourselves do wake or sleep.[65]

In his theology Hooker came precariously close to the views expressed in the Arminian Remonstrance in 1610. But, unlike Arminius and his successors, Hooker did not write so much in response to Calvinism as in defense of Elizabethan theology. Though he held "Arminian" views, he did not respond as an anti-Calvinist or "Arminian." He did not seek confrontation with the extreme Calvinist theology. Not only did he never mention the Calvinists by name, but even when commenting upon the Lambeth Articles, he did not see fit

---

[65]Hooker, II, 597.

either to mention the Articles by name or to attack them directly. It is this reluctance to respond to the opposition that distinguished Hooker not only from the Dutch Arminians, but also from his contemporary, Lancelot Andrewes.

The treatise attributed to Lancelot Andrewes,[66] at that time a chaplain to Whitgift, was, unlike Hooker's articles, a direct critique of the Lambeth Articles. Entitled "Judgment of the Lambeth Articles,"[67] the treatise was originally attached to a brief history of the Articles published in 1651.[68]

---

[66]Most historians of the period and biographers of Andrewes consider Andrewes the author. The one exception that I have found is A.T. Russell, The Life and Works of Lancelot Andrewes (Cambridge, 1860). Russell claimed that the work was "published by some person or persons who retained neither the doctrine of Andrewes, nor of Overall," (pp. 59-60). Russell based his argument on the comment on Article VII which according to him contradicted Andrewes's Whit-Sunday Sermon of 1612. Florence Higham, Lancelot Andrewes (London, 1912), G.M. Story, ed., Lancelot Andrewes' Sermons (Oxford, 1967), Paul Welsby, Lancelot Andrewes 1555-1626 (London, 1958) and S.J. Reidy, Bishop Lancelot Andrewes (Chicago, 1955), however, have no doubt about Andrewes's authorship of the treatise.

[67]There is a text of the treatise in the British Museum, Add. MS 34312. The text used in this study is that contained in L. Andrewes, A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine and Other Minor Works ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology;" Oxford, 1846).

[68]This history, entitled simply Articuli Lambethani presented not only an historical account of the Whitaker-Whitgift compromise, but also a critical commentary of the Articles. The author was an unknown man who described himself as F.G. Sancti Nicolai apud Tinobantes Minister. See Sargeaunt, p. 260. An account of F.G.'s criticism goes beyond the historical span of this study, but I have included a brief description in the Appendix.

By natural inclination Andrewes like Hooker was an Elizabethan moderate. In the introduction to his critique he expressed objection to any attempt to impose a theology of predestination upon the Church of England. Silence was preferable to the effort "to erect into a system what was essentially a mystery and thus diverted religion into speculative and ultimately futile channels."[69] The silence that Andrewes desired was the quiet, non-doctrinaire "silence" of the Elizabethan moderates. It was a silence grounded in the admonition that God's decrees were by "his counsel secret to us." But the claims and efforts of the Calvinists to impose their doctrine upon the English Church culminating in the Barret affair and the Lambeth Articles forced the moderate Andrewes to speak out. He responded to the Calvinist theology not only with a direct critique of the work of the Lambeth Conference, but also with a treatise in defense of Barret.[70] With this step into direct confrontation with the Calvinist theology, Andrewes "became" an "English Arminian." His Arminian-like theology ceased to be an opinion permitted without the broad framework of the Elizabethan Settlement, and became a direct response to the Calvinistic claims on the Church of England.

Not surprisingly, Andrewes's main points of contention

---

[69] Welsby, p. 44.

[70] Censura Censurae D. Barreti de Certitudine Salutis in Andrewes, A Pattern of..., pp. 301 ff.

with the Articles involved their assertions concerning reprobation, their implication of limited atonement, and their completely theocentric approach to the problem of predestination.

On Article I Andrewes urged no revision. He merely stressed that one should still be free to say that God's foreknowledge was the basis of predestination. Moreover, the immediate cause of election was the grace of Christ; of reprobation, the sins of man.[71]

To Article II Andrewes would add "in Christ" thus making the article read: "...but only the will of the good pleasure of God in Christ."[72] Although his method of alteration differed, Andrewes's purpose here was the same as Hooker's. Where Hooker chose to delete the last part of the article in order to avoid portraying election as the effect of a blind, irrespective decree, Andrewes used the insertion of "in Christ" to stress the mercy as opposed to the arbitrariness behind God's election. Moreover, in his gloss on the article Andrewes argued that the doctrine of arbitrary election was no election at all. By definition election implied discrimination, and consequently, the consideration of some human attribute. In spite of the fact that the elected man was in no way deserving of salvation,

---

[71] Andrewes, A Pattern of..., p. 295.

[72] Ibid., pp. 295-96. "...beneplacitum Dei in Christo."

the acceptance of God's gift of grace through Christ was in itself discriminating, and set the recipient off from those who refused that gift. The decree of election was based upon divine foreknowledge of those who would accept grace and those who would not.[73]

Andrewes affirmed Article III with only a note that it repeated the very words of Augustine.[74] This concern with the use of patristic and New Testament language was to become typical of the anti-Calvinist response in England.[75] In this area the anti-Calvinists were not unlike the Elizabethan moderates. Whitgift had used the argument of patristic language in urging changes in the Whitaker draft of the Lambeth Articles.[76] Also Hutton, who had found the Articles acceptable as framed, felt a need to note that they were in accordance with the teachings of Augustine. But by the 1620's the tendency to turn to "the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, with its elaborated creed and full grown

---

[73] Ibid., p. 297

[74] Ibid., p. 298. From his comments on the preceding article it safely can be assumed that he understood the article in the sense of Hooker, i.e., the number of predestinate was certain because of God's foreknowledge.

[75] As early as the 1580's Harsnett had buttressed his theology with frequent references to Augustine.

[76] "Whitgift had moved the issues back beyond the quarrels of Whitaker and Barret to Augustine and the New Testament." Porter, Reformation..., p. 371.

splendcur"[77] became particularly identified with Laudian Arminianism.

As previously noted Article IV, like Article III, was susceptible to both a Calvinistic and a more liberal interpretation. Andrewes accepted the article in its more liberal sense.

> ...(as the article itself explains) on account of the sins, and thus because they have sinned, and not because they are predestined.[78]

His only suggestion for specific change in the language of the article involved the substitution of the more patristic words "certo" or "sine dubio" ("certainly" or "without doubt") for "necessario" (necessarily).

On perseverance (Article V) Andrewes only partially supported Barret. Unlike Barret, Andrewes held that those not elected never held true faith, that they "ought not to be charged with falling from faith, their faith never having been true and lively."[79]

But Andrewes did oppose the implication of Article V that the elect could not temporarily lose faith totally.

I think it still can be questioned

---

[77]Tulloch, I, 61.

[78]Andrewes, A Pattern of..., p. 298. "...(ut articulus ipse se explicat) propter peccata, ideoque quia peccarunt, non autme ideo quia non sunt praedestinati..."

[79]Ibid., p. 299. "Atque hoc propter apostatas, quibus vitio dari non debet quod excidant a fide, quae vera et viva nunquam fuit."

> whether the Holy Spirit can be lost for a time; or extinguished nearly so that there is no return or recompense possible.[80]

He did not change the wording of the article for the phrase "that 'faith cannot be totally lost' may be thus explained; that although the whole of it may be lost, it cannot be lost wholly for good or irrecoverably, that is, so lost that there is no opportunity for men to return whence they fell."[81] Although repentance is not specifically mentioned, implied in his comment on the wording of Article V is Andrewes's belief that man played some role in the return to grace. Andrewes opposed the Calvinistic notion that the seeds of faith in the elect were indestructible by the fact of election. That the elect inevitably returned to faith was due not to an indestructible seed God had planted, but to God's infallible foreknowledge that the particular strayer would in fact repent and return. Put simply, God's prescience of man's actions, not God's election of man, lay at the base of the final indefectibility of grace in the elect.

In Article VI Andrewes would have had Whitgift extract an even greater concession from the Calvinists. Whitgift

---

[80] Ibid. "An vero Spirtus Sanctus ad tempus auferri aut extinqui possit, existimo quaeri adhuc posse, facteor haerere me."

[81] Ibid. "Etsi non sum nescius, et hoc ipsum, ⌜non posse amitti totaliter⌝ exponi posse sic, ut in totum prorsus vel penitus amitti nequeat, esti tota amittatur, id est, ita amitti ut non sit locus revertendi unde exciderunt."

had changed Whitaker's "certainty of faith" to "assurance of faith." Andrewes recommended the use of the even weaker phrase "assurance of hope" in order to sustain Barret's distinction between assurance of something categorical, and an assurance of something conditional. For Andrewes, as for Barret, assurance of salvation was most definitely conditional upon perseverance in faith. And as the "end" was foreknown only to God, one could only "hope" that temptation would not be beyond human endurance. Moreover, Andrewes argued, as had Saravia, that endurance and the resultant perseverance were products of anxiety about, rather than confidence in, one's own salvation.[82]

Andrewes's comments on Articles VII and VIII opposed the Calvinist notion of limited atonement implied in those articles. On the Lambeth statement that grace was not granted to all men, Andrewes commented:

> I do not think that saving grace is conferred on all, but it is offered to all.[83]

Like Hooker, Andrewes held that baptism was the vehicle for the offering and reception of grace. In baptism the disposition to receive saving grace was conferred upon all.

---

[82] See Andrewes's Censura Censurae D. Barreti de Certitudine Salutis in ibid., pp. 301 ff. The main theme of this short treatise was an attack on the Calvinist doctrine of assurance.

[83] Andrewes, A Pattern of..., p. 300. "Gratiam salutarem non existimo conferri omnibus; sed offerri tamen omnibus."

This disposition made it possible for the baptised to accept the gift of actual efficacious grace if he so willed. No man could be saved without God's grace; but no man was refused the possibility of receiving that grace.

With a similar argument Andrewes attempted to eject Calvinism from the eighth article. According to Andrewes the Lambeth statement that "all men are not drawn by the Father to come to the Son" should be understood in the sense of actually drawn, for in fact all men were potentially drawn. That all were not drawn in the actual sense, i.e., so that they could not resist that draw, "has its cause in the dissolute will of these people themselves, not in the will of God."[84]

In spite of his rejection of the Calvinistic deprecation of man, Andrewes would not go so far as to make a general affirmation of free will. His comments on the last Lambeth Article merely repeated the urgings with which he introduced his commentary on the Articles.

> I advise now, as I said in the beginning a faithful silence on both things.[85]

But it was not the displeasure of such churchmen as Hooker and Andrewes that marked the failure of the Lambeth

---

[84] Ibid. "...caussam (sic!) esse dissalutam ipsorum hominum voluntatem, non absolutam voluntatem Dei!"

[85] Ibid. "...ego quod ab initio suasi etiamnum suadeo, fidele utrinque silentium." "Both things" refers to election and reprobation.

Articles. Rather it was the failure of the Articles themselves either to clarify successfully the English position on predestination or to bring about the desired peace at Cambridge.

In January of 1596 Peter Baro delivered a sermon attacking the Calvinist notions of reprobation and limited atonement. In this sermon Baro claimed:

> That in Adam God created all men according to his own likeness and also for life eternal: to which no one shall be denied, unless for sin...
>
> That Christ died sufficiently for all men.
>
> That the promises of God made to us in Christ as they are declared generally in sacred letters, are to be understood generally...[86]

Like Hooker[87] and Harsnett,[88] Baro accounted for reprobation by distinguishing between an antecedent and a consequent will in God. By his antecedent will God would save all men, but by his consequent will, he would reprobate those whose "own deeds shall have cast them off."[89]

But Baro's major contribution to the theological

---

[86]Baro to Burghley, February 9, 1596. Letter in T. Heywood and T. Wright, eds., Cambridge University Transactions During the Puritan Controversies (London, 1854), II, 97.

[87]Hooker, III, 592.

[88]Harsnett, p. 154.

[89]Heywood and Wright, II, 91.

controversy at Cambridge lay not so much in his theology of reprobation as in his theology of grace. Through Christ God's grace was offered to every man "excepting him who should will to exclude himself through his own sin."[90] Like Arminius, Baro held that the Calvinistic doctrine made both Christ's sacrificial death and man's will irrelevant to predestination. Also like Arminius, and in this case, like his anti-Calvinist contemporaries, Baro sought to restore Christ and man to relevancy by constructing a theology of predestination around God's foreknowledge.

In 1594 Baro had written a treatise entitled Summa trium de praedestinatione Sententiarum which described Baro's own predestination theology by contrasting it with the supralapsarian and sublapsarian doctrines. In this work Baro asserted that God's foreknowledge upon which predestination was based was perfect and unerring, but it imposed no necessity upon the will of man. All men were invited to faith and salvation. That certain men did not accept God's gift was due to their own perversity and depravity, not to God's decree.[91]

It was not this treatise (it was not published until 1613), but Baro's January sermon that precipitated another

---

[90]Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXIX, 347. "...nisi quis velit seipsum ab hoc beneficio excludere sua propria culpa;..."

[91]Baro, Peter, Summa Trium de Praedestinatione Sententiarum (1613).

confrontation between the Calvinists and the anti-Calvinists at Cambridge. Although the theological controversy was concentrated on Baro's assertions of the universality of grace, the actual charge laid against Baro was that he had violated Whitgift's directives, and had disturbed the peace of the University by preaching against the Lambeth Articles.[92]

In fact Baro had not mentioned the Lambeth Articles in his sermon. He had based his argument for the universal benefit of Christ's death on Article Thirty-one of the Thirty-nine,[93] and his argument for the universal application of God's promises of salvation upon Article seventeen.[94] Baro's professed goal in the sermon had not been to dispute the Lambeth Articles, but to confute the arguments of a German theologian, John Piscator.[95]

Nevertheless Baro was well aware that his sermon was

---

[92]See the notes of the first conference between Baro, the Vice-chancellor, and the prefects of the Colleges, January 7, 1596 (NS) in Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXVII, 342-44. Also see the complaint against Baro in ibid., Document XXIX, 346-47.

[93]"The offering of Christ once made, is the perfect redemption, propiciation, and satisfaction for all the sinnes of the whole world, both original and actual..."

[94]"...we must receive God's promises in such way, as they be generally set forth to us in holy scriptures:..."

[95]John Piscator (1546-1625) was a professor of philosophy at Heidelberg. He was known to adhere to Zwingli's theology of predestination, but I have not been able to find any particular work on the subject written by Piscator, It is possible that the views Baro was refuting were expressed in Piscator's biblical commentaries.

in direct opposition to Calvinistic theology. As he later noted in a letter to Lord Burghley, his topics did not fall well upon the ears of those "who strive to persuade that God has till now created and daily creates the greatest part of mankind expressly to destruction; that from the damnation of those he might increase glory unto Himself." Nor was it pleasing to those who hold that "Christ's death was in no wise for all, not because many reject the blessing of it, but that He himself is unwilling that His death should be efficacious for them; and that therefore these same are not created unto salvation, but rather unto destruction."[96]

As for the Lambeth Articles, Baro dealt with them in a unique way. Instead of arguing for changes in the language of the Articles (as had Hooker and Andrewes), Baro handled the Calvinistic overtones with a strategy that had been the Calvinists's own. Making maximum use of the loopholes in the language of the Articles, he interpreted them in such a way as to rid them of their Calvinism, arguing that in so doing, he was preventing innovation and destruc-

---

[96]Baro to Burghley, February 9, 1596 (NS) in ibid., Document XXVIII, 345. "...qui jam persuadere conantur, Deum maximam hominum partem ad interitum de industriâ hactenus creasse, et quotidie creare; ut ex illorum perditione gloriam sibi acquirat. Et Christum nequaquam in omnibus mortuum esse; non quod multi beneficium illius respuant, sed quod ipse nolit suam illis mortem prodesse: proptorea quod sint non ad salutem, ut alii, sed ad exitium creati. Eademque de causa nolunt promissiones esse generales, sed ad paucos illos solos eas extendunt, imo restringunt potius: quos etiam solos dicunt à Deo creatos esse, ut servarentur.

tion of established doctrine.

As early as December of 1595, upon receipt of the Articles and Whitgift's directives, Baro had written to Whitgift that, properly interpreted, the Articles did not forbid Baro's positions on reprobation and assurance.[97] When the charges were laid against him for his sermon in January, he wrote again to Whitgift claiming that he was concerned not with confuting or denying the nine articles, but with protecting the Thirty-nine. The Calvinists, on the other hand, "did so interpret and urge...those nine articles, just as if they had been framed, namely, to this end, by him the Archbishop and the rest, to abolish those old ones, confirmed by authority of Queen and Parliament."[98] With this letter Baro enclosed a copy of his comments on the Articles.[99]

In Article I Baro used the repetition of the word "some" to distinguish between believers and unbelievers. God had predestined some men, i.e., believers, to life; and reprobated some, i.e., unbelievers, to death.[100] Moreover,

---

[97]Baro to Whitgift, December 18, 1595, quoted in ibid., II, 288.

[98]Baro to Whitgift, January 14, 1596 (NS), quoted in ibid., II, 292.

[99]According to Porter, Baro had already made these comments known to Whitgift in December. (Reformation..., p. 379.)

[100]F.G. used the words "some...and some" for the same purpose. See Appendix III.

it was not specific men, but specific kinds of men whom God elected and reprobated.

> For God did not directly and absolutely predestine David and Peter unto life, as likewise He did not directly and absolutely cast off unto death Saul and Judas; but these same (as) unbelievers, rebels, obstinate in sin.[101]

In Article II Baro went further than either Hooker or Andrewes. Playing on the word "efficient," he broadened (and twisted) the full meaning of the Article. Though faith, perseverance and good works were not the efficient cause of election, without them "there is no entering into heaven," for "they are the means by which the sharers in divine predestination are restored unto blessedness."[102]

In Articles III and IV Baro, like Andrewes, took the liberal interpretation of the alternatives left open by the language of the articles. The number of elect was fixed by divine prescience, not by divine absolutism. The reprobate were damned not out of the necessity of absolute predestination, but because of their sins and disbeliefs. This interpretation limited, but did not take great liberty with the

---

[101] Strype, The Life and Acts..., III, Document XXVI, 340. "Neque enim Deus simpliciter et absolute Davidem et Petrum ad vitam praedestinavit, quemadmodum nec simpliciter et absolute Saulum et Judam rejecit ad mortem: sed eosdem incredulos, rebelles, et in peccatis contumaces."

[102] Ibid. "Et tamen sine fide, perseverantia, bonis operibus, nullus ad coelum aditus." "...media tamen sunt, quibus divinae hujus ac beatae praedestinationis participes reddimur."

wording of the article.

With Article V Baro took full advantage of the phrase "in the elect." Using the phrase as a qualifying one, he was able to interpret the article to mean: The "whole justifying faith...is sometimes lost." But in the elect, it is never so wholly lost "but through penance afterward it is restored."[103] Baro thus gave the article a meaning totally opposite from that which the Lambeth compromise had intended. The distinction between elect and reprobate and between final and temporary loss of faith lay neither in God's absolute decree nor in the nature of true justifying faith, but in man's capacity for repentance.

Baro's comments on Article VI present the best example of his refined art of "Jesuistic casuistry." He took the words "through Christ" and used them to turn the Calvinistic theology of absolute assurance into the liberal doctrine of assurance conditional upon perseverance.

> Who by justifying faith is foreordained is sure by faith of the remission of his sins, and of the resulting life eternal; not indeed absolutely, but through Christ; as is said in the article; that is, if he should cling to Christ constantly to the end.[104]

---

[103] Ibid., III, 341. "Amittitur ergo nonnunquam tota fides justificans." "...non amitti in electis, quin per poenitentiam postea restauretur."

[104] Ibid., III, 341-42. "Qui fide justificante praeditus est, certus est per fidem de remissione peccatorum suorum, et de vita aeterna consequenda: non quidem absolute, sed per Christum; ut dicitur in Articulo, i.e. Si Christo ad

His comments on Articles VII and VIII were essentially the same as Andrewes's. Relying upon the absence of the word "offered" in VII, he argued that saving grace was not granted, etc., but it was offered to all men. And without using Andrewes's terms - actually and potentially - he stated the same position on Article VIII.

> Not all are called, and come; that is not all are called to such an extent that they come.[105]

Unlike Andrewes, Baro did not studiously avoid a general statement on free will. In Article nine he used the object of the article (salvation) to limit the general intent of its meaning. Salvation was not within human capacity; it was the work of Christ by supernatural grace. But reprobation was in man's power and responsible will.

Baro's acceptance of the Lambeth Articles as they stood is no argument for their comprehensive character. In four cases (Articles I, II, V, VI) he "played on" words in order to draw out his interpretation. And in three cases he built his liberal interpretation on what was not said in the articles (Articles VII, VIII, IX). Only in two cases (III, IV) was his interpretation clear and legitimate within the actual wording of the articles. Most important, it was only by a studied avoidance of the general meaning

---

finem usque adhaeserit."

[105] Ibid., p. 342. "Non trahuntur omnes, ut veniant; i.e. Non trahuntur omnes, ita ut veniant."

of the articles that Baro was able to pull out of them a liberal theology.

One could hazard a guess that if his personal situation had been a less precarious one, Baro might have written a real critique of the Articles. But, unlike Hooker and Andrewes, Baro was politically and academically in no position to be openly defiant. The ferment that had precipitated the framing of the Articles had involved Baro's protege; and the Articles had been directed as much to Baro as they had been to his younger followers. Moreover, Baro was a Frenchman, a fact which his enemies were not hesitant to point to.[106]

But ultimately Baro's conservatism in regard to the Articles did not save him his academic position. In spite of the support of Lancelot Andrewes, Samuel Harsnett, John Overall,[107] and Chancellor Burghley's advice to Goad on the matter - "You may punish him if you will: but you shall do it for well doing in holding the truth, in my opinion,"[108] - Baro was not reelected to the Lady Margaret professorship in September of 1596. At most he was offered a position giving

---

[106] See letter of Hutton to Whitgift regarding Baro, quoted in ibid., II, p. 309; and also letter of Whitgift to Goad, January 13, 1596 (NS) quoted in ibid., II, 296.

[107] Ibid., II, 303 ff.

[108] Quoted in ibid., II, 303.

Hebrew lectures in private houses.[109] But Baro did not accept the humble position. Instead he went on to London where he died in 1599.

In the year of Baro's death yet another predestination controversy broke out at Cambridge. The contenders were John Overall, newly appointed Regius Professor of Divinity, and Barret's old antagonists, Goad and Chaderton. The point at issue in this controversy was the old question of the relationship between assurance, perseverance and repentance. For the most part Overall repeated Barret's and Baro's old arguments, but put a greater stress upon the need for repentance in the elect. A Christian could trust in his election only if he "in true repentance flieth to the throne of grace, and there apprehendeth Christ, with his merits, in the promises of the Gospel."[110] Overall would accept the Lambeth statement on perseverance if the term "carere" (to be destitute of) were substituted for "amittere" (to lose). In other words, the elect, by definition, could never be entirely destitute of saving grace, but without repentance for their sins, they would be subject to God's wrath.

Unlike the Barret and Baro cases, Overall's challenge to orthodox Calvinism was never brought to the attention of

---

[109] Ibid., II, 390.

[110] Quoted in Porter, Reformation..., p. 402.

the church authorities outside of the University. No satisfactory conclusion was reached, and the issue raised by Overall continued to fester until the Hampton Court Conference in 1604.

Called by the new monarch, James I, this conference was James's "peace-offering" to the militant Calvinists or Puritans. The Puritans present included John Reynolds and Thomas Spark of Oxford, William Chaderton and Thomas Knewstubs of Cambridge. The anti-Calvinists included John Overall and Lancelot Andrewes, with such churchmen as Whitgift, Richard Bancroft, Thomas Bilson, Gervase Babbington, Thomas Dove, and others representing the moderate Elizabethan viewpoint.[111]

---

[111] There are two published contemporary accounts of the Hampton Court Conference. The first is that of William Barlow, The Summe and Substance of the Conference Which It Pleased His Excellent Majestie to Have With the Lords Bishops, and Others of His Clergie (At Which The Most of the Lords of the Councell Were Present) in His Majesties Privi-Chamber, at Hampton Court, January 14, 1603 reprinted in Edward Cardwell, A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings Connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer; from the Year 1558 to the Year 1690 (Oxford, 1840), pp. 167-212. The second account is appended to Roland G. Usher, The Reconstruction of the English Church (New York, 1910). Despite this appendix, in his work Usher used the Barlow account. See Mark Curtis, "The Hampton Court Conference and Its Aftermath," History, XLVI, no. 156 (February, 1961), 1-17. The major works on English church history all contain accounts of the conference. On the predestination issue these accounts are in general agreement with the exception of Usher who states that James was told that the Lambeth Articles "were not intended to be a statement of the faith of the Church, and were therefore unworthy of inclusion." (I, 323-24). Neither Barlow nor any other primary source contains such a statement. In this chapter I have used the Barlow account as my source.

The question of the Lambeth Articles was raised on the second day of the conference by Dr. Reynolds. Arguing that the Articles of Religion concluded in 1562 were obscure in places, he requested that the words "yet neither totally nor finally" be added to Article XVI - "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace" - and that the Lambeth Articles be inserted into the Book of Articles. He was interrupted by Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London, who spoke out in opposition to the first motion, the amendation of Article XVI. He insisted that the seventeenth article - "We must receive God's promises, in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scriptures" - contained the full teachings of the Church of England on predestination. To add further would encourage those who, "neglecting holinesse of life, presumed too much of persisting of grace, laying all their religion upon predestination, If I shall be saved, I shall be saved;...a desperate doctrine...contrary to good divinity, and the true doctrine of predestination."

> ...we should reason rather <u>ascendo</u> than <u>descendo</u>, thus: "I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbors, I follow my vocation, etc., therefore, I trust that God hath elected me, and predestined me to salvation," not thus, which is the usual course of argument, "God hath predestined and chose me to life, therefore though I sin never so grievously, yet I shall not be damned; for whom he once loveth, he

loveth to the end.[112]

James expressed pleasure at Bancroft's words and proceeded to expand on them by discoursing on Paul's warning "Work out your salvation in fear and trembling." At the same time he attempted to please Reynolds by offering to have inserted the word "often" so that the article would read "We may often depart from grace," but this did nothing to reconcile the Calvinists who were not so concerned with the clarity of the article as with having inserted some affirmation of final and total perseverance. Here, as elsewhere at the conference, James avoided any specific commitments on predestination. His major concern was that the topic be handled with great discretion "lest on the one side, God's omnipotency might be called in question, by impeaching the doctrine of his eternal predestination, or on the other, a desperate presumption might be arreared, by inferring the necessary certainty of standing and persisting in grace."[113] As will be seen, James's discretion in avoiding the two extremes resulted in some very confusing and contradictory theology.

After some discussion of Reynolds's other points on the ministry and church government, Reynolds again made reference to the desired inclusion of the Lambeth Articles

---

[112] Barlow, p. 181.

[113] *Ibid.*

into the Articles of Religion. This time James replied directly to the motion, professing complete ignorance of what was meant by the "nine assertions concluded at Lambeth." He was not informed thereupon of the content of the Articles, but merely "that by reason of some controversies, arising in Cambridge, about certain points of divinity, my lords grace assembled some divines of especial note, to set down their opinions, which they drew into nine assertions, and so sent them to the university, for the appeasing of those quarrels..."[114]

With this very general description of the Lambeth Articles, James could not very well respond theologically to Reynolds's motion. He did not seek more information, but replied noncommittally:

> When such questions arise amongst scholars the quietest proceedings were to determine them in the university, and not to stuff the Book of Articles with all conclusions theological.
>
> Secondly, the better course would be to punish the broachers of false doctrine, as occasion should be offered: for were the articles never so many and sound, who can prevent the contrary opinions of men till they be heard?[115]

---

[114] Ibid., p. 185.

[115] Ibid. In 1615 James did authorize the inclusion of the Lambeth Articles into the Articles of the Church of Ireland. Arthur P. Kautz, ("The Jacobean Episcopate and Its Legacy" /unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1952/, pp. 165-66) claims this indicates no

John Overall then took the floor and drew the discussion back to the question of indefectibility. He presented his view that in grievously sinning the elect fell into a state of wrath and damnation, but were in time renewed by God's Spirit to a lively faith and repentance. His opponents at Cambridge, he claimed, had argued that though the elect commit grievous sins they still remained in a state of justification. And if they should die before repenting of those sins, they would still be justified and saved without repentance.

James's response this time was not so much general, as contradictory. Barlow notes that James was "in utter dislike of" the doctrine of Overall's opponents. He spoke accordingly of the necessity of repentance as well as true

---

contradictory policy on the part of James. He could have studied the Lambeth Articles, and by this time, knowing their content, changed his mind. Heylyn, (Aerius Redivivus..., pp. 342-45) claimed that James was motivated by political factors: (1) he was committed to the Dutch Calvinists and did not want to reject those opinions in Ireland which he countenanced in Holland; (2) he wished to balance the Papist and Romanist tendencies in the Irish Church by inserting more Calvinistic articles.

Kautz's view of James seems to ignore the fact that pure theology played very little part in James's actions. Also I find it hard to accept that in 1615 James was so satisfied with the Lambeth theology that he would have it incorporated into the Irish Church, but would take no moves to do the same for England. Heylyn's first claim in regard to the commitment to the contra-Remonstrants is not valid, for in 1615 James was still parleying with the Remonstrants. He did not commit himself finally until 1617. (See Chapter IV of this study.) But the argument that James wished to offset the Romanism of the Irish Church does make sense in the light of James's frequent tendencies to use theology for other than theological purposes.

faith in salvation. But he closed his speech with the following:

> ...it was hypocrisie, and not true justifying faith, which was severed from them: for although predestination and election depend not upon any qualities, actions, or works of man, which be mutable, but upon Gods eternal and immutable decree and purpose; yet such is the necessity of repentance, after known sins committed, as that, without it, there could not be either reconciliation with God or remission of those sins.[116]

The statement makes absolutely no sense. In spite of his "utter dislike" of the extreme Calvinist position on indefectibility, he now said that true justifying faith could not fall away, and then proceeded to defend the new position by affirming Overall's statement on the necessity of repentance!

There is no clear explanation for James's confusion. D.H. Willson calls the remarks "puzzling," and hazards the guess that James still believed in the strict predestination theology he had been taught in Scotland, but at the same time, was aware of the difficulties to which that doctrine led.[117] James's previous statement and his general unwilling-

---

[116] Barlow, p. 186.

[117] D.H. Willson, King James VI and I (London, 1956), p. 455, note 7. Kautz claims that Barlow erred in describing James as "in utter dislike" of the Calvinist doctrine. He thinks that "the direct quotation of the King only indicates that he neatly sidestepped the doctrinal position" (p. 162). Kautz completely ignores the fact that the quotation makes no sense.

ness to offend the Calvinists on the predestination issue support this thesis. James responded to the doctrinal dilemma by evasion. When he finally did speak to the specific theological points at issue, his efforts to contain both sides resulted in theological nonsense.

Previous to this statement, his policy of avoidance by granting essentially nothing to either side had worked. He had based his refusal to incorporate the Lambeth Articles into the Thirty-nine Articles not on theology, but on his concern not to overburden the formal confession of the Church. He had attempted to balance his sympathy with Bancroft's comments on reasoning ascendo with the misguided offer to include the word "often" in Article XVI. Only in response to Overall did his own theological confusion become obvious.

In terms of predestination theology, the Hampton Conference was a failure for the Calvinists. For the anti-Calvinists it was a success only in that the Lambeth Articles were not incorporated into the Articles of Religion. The Conference resolved none of the points of difference between the two groups, and did nothing to clarify the vagueness of Elizabethan church doctrine. At most the Hampton meeting gave both the Calvinists and their opponents an opportunity to see that their new monarch was not about to commit himself indiscriminately to either of the opposing positions.

While the anti-Calvinists made no gains as a movement in the first decades of James's reign, individual men who had attacked the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination did advance in the Universities and in the Church. At Cambridge, Lancelot Andrewes was appointed Master of Pembroke College. In 1609 he was consecrated to the bishopric of Ely, and in 1619, the see of Winchester. Samuel Harsnett succeeded Andrewes at Pembroke in 1605; John Overall succeeded the Calvinist Whitaker as Regius Professor, and in 1618 was made Bishop of Norwich. At Oxford, John Howson, the Vice-chancellor, tried to strengthen the anti-Calvinists in 1602 by drawing up a set of anti-Calvinist articles that would prohibit Puritan preachings against the ceremonies and disciplines of the Church.[118] But Howson's articles never became official, and the Calvinists remained the dominant party at Oxford.

During these years (1604-1619) little was heard of either the Cambridge controversy or the Lambeth Articles. Instead, during the second decade of the century, attention turned to the predestination controversy in the Netherlands.[119]

---

[118]Wood, The History and Antiquities..., II, 277-78.

[119]The single direct connection between the Cambridge controversy and the Dutch controversy over predestination existed by way of Arminius's response to a treatise of William Perkins. Unfortunately the response was not completed and published until after Perkins's death in 1602. See Arminius, III, 282 ff.

C H A P T E R IV

JAMES AND DUTCH ARMINIANISM

Before examining the role that James played in the Arminian controversy in the Netherlands, it is necessary to trace summarily the development of that controversy after the issuance of the Grand Remonstrance in 1610.[1]

Between 1610 and 1617 the theological conflict was set within the context of finding some means of resolving the tensions between the orthodox Calvinists or contra-Remonstrants and the Arminians or Remonstrants. Until 1617 the problem was relatively isolated to the province of Holland where the orthodox Calvinists were in a minority. The Remonstrants and the governing body of the province, the States of Holland, advocated a policy of "mutual toleration." The contra-Remonstants of Holland, on the other hand, desired an explicit resolution of the controversy through a National Synod, a resolution which in fact meant a condemnation of the Grand Remonstrance and the theology of Arminius. For a time the Remonstrants were willing to accept a National Synod, but only if a revision of the Heidelburg Catechism and Confession was open to discussion, a stipulation that minimized the possibility of such a Synod

---

[1]See Chapter I, note 21.

becoming merely a trial of them and their opinions. As the orthodox were unwilling to consider such a revision, the calling of a National Synod was ineffectual as a resolving measure.

To silence both contending factions, the States of Holland in 1614 issued under the pen of Hugo Grotius an edict that forbade public preaching on any of the five disputed points, and carefully delineated the points of predestination theology that could be taught publicly.

The Edict opened with a condemnation of the extreme position that taught "directly, or at least indirectly, that God has created some men to damn them; that He has laid certain men under a necessity of sinning; that He invites some men to salvation to whom he has resolved to deny it," and of the opposite extreme which asserted "that man's natural strength or works may operate salvation."[2] Although the general tone was appeasement of both parties for the sake of peace in church and state, the Edict was far more severe with the extreme orthodox position than with the theology of the Remonstrants. Since the Arminians had never held that man through his natural capacities alone could achieve salvation, it would appear that the condemnation of that extreme Pelagian doctrine was offered

---

[2]"Resolution for Peace in the Church," reprinted in the appendix of Hamilton Vreeland, Hugo Grotius (New York, 1917), p. 244.

up as a tokenism in the face of a serious condemnation of the extreme Calvinist theology.

The "peace program" offered by the Edict demanded that efforts to harass and proselytize those who would teach a moderate doctrine of predestination theology, i.e., election, free unmerited grace, and final perseverance in faith through that grace - points common to the theologies of both parties - end.[3] It also insisted that the five disputed points of theology, which according to the Edict were not points of faith relevant to salvation, no longer be the subjects of public preaching.

The Edict was unsuccessful as a peacemaker, first of all because of its moderate nature, but more importantly because of its secular, civil source. The contra-Remonstrants were no more willing to admit the authority of temporal magistrates in ecclesiastical matters than they were to tolerate an Arminian faction within their Church.[4] As a result, an unofficial schism developed in the churches of Holland. Since the full Calvinist theology was not permitted to be preached in the churches of the province, the contra-Remonstrants took to forming "churches" in private homes and barns; pamphlet warfare between the contending

---

[3] Ibid., p. 246.

[4] Dudley Carleton to Ralph Winwood, The Hague, September 28, 1616, Dudley Carleton, Sir Dudley Carleton's Letters 1615-1620 (London, 1775), pp. 57-58.

parties was intensified, and the threat of riots and disorders in the major cities of Holland increased.

The religious situation was peculiarly complicated by the political and personal rivalries with which it became intertwined. The religious conflict became one aspect of the provincial rivalries between the seven states which made up the United Provinces or Netherlands. During the war with Spain these rivalries had been suppressed by the need for a united front. But with the Twelve Year Truce in 1609, the "front" fell apart, and the unclarified and complicated federation system was faced with forceful assertions of local autonomy. Holland, as the most powerful of the provinces, was particularly concerned with maintaining provincial autonomy. The other provinces, equally as jealous for their independence, sought a means of counteracting Holland's dominant position within the federation.

In 1617 the religious controversy became the modus operandi of these less powerful provinces for asserting themselves against strife-ridden Holland. The tool was the States General, the governing body of the federation; the excuse - the Arminian controversy; and the method - a calling of a National Synod which not only would intervene in the religious affairs that Holland considered within her provincial jurisdiction, but also would overthrow the Remonstrant oligarchy which ruled that state.

The religious and political situations were further

complicated by the personal rivalry between the leading political figures of the United Provinces - Prince Maurice, elected Stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Overyssel, and Gelderland, and John of Oldenbarnevelt, Advocate of Holland. The bitterness and differences between the two men can be traced back to the truce with Spain in 1609, a truce that Barnevelt had encouraged and that Maurice, as commander in chief of the armies, had opposed.[5] In the second decade of the seventeenth century the conflict between them centered on the question of the powers inherent in the position of Stadtholder during peace time. According to Barnevelt, whose chief interest as Holland's leading statesman, lay in maintaining her autonomy, the Stadtholder was a servant of the provincial states which had elected him. According to Maurice the loyalties of that office were to the federation as a whole, and not subject to the authority of any particular province.

Maurice was not a theologian, and before 1617 had declined to get involved in the religious controversy.[6] But by 1617 he had come around to the contra-Remonstrant position. In January of that year he demonstrated his political-religious stand by refusing military aid for use against contra-Remonstrants in Hague who were meeting in

---

[5] Vreeland, pp. 74-75.

[6] Harrison, Arminianism, pp. 68-69.

private homes. He justified his refusal by the claim that he was bound by his oath of office to defend the reformed religion.[7]

The year 1617 marked the turning point for the Remonstrants of Holland. Holland's rival states began to push for a National Synod authorized by the States General. And the Stadtholder, now a contra-Remonstrant, began using his military position to destroy the Arminian opposition and its leading political spokesmen, Barnevelt and Hugo Grotius.

In August the States of Holland took two steps to thwart the efforts of their opponents. Under the influence of Grotius the States passed a resolution encouraging a general Synod of all Reformed Churches to solve the religious question. Such a synod - giving expression to the ideal of Christian unity - would have no political context and consequently would pose no threat to the political autonomy of Holland. To fill the vacuum left by Maurice's refusal of military aid to the Remonstrant state, the States passed a second resolution empowering the town magistrates to raise their own militia. These militiamen took their oath of allegiance to Holland with no mention of Maurice.

In both cases the States of Holland was fighting a losing battle. In November of 1617 the States General met

---

[7]Harrison, The Beginnings..., pp. 243-44.

and passed the resolution for a National Synod. The opposing minority which included major sections of Holland, Gelderland and Overyssel, left the assembly when the resolution was read. Futilely, Holland persisted in her efforts to stop the Synod from meeting. Standing on provincial rights, she declared the action of the States General illegal; when the official invitations to elect representatives to the Synod were sent out, Holland sent hers back unopened; and then sent letters of protest to all the foreign courts which had received such invitations. All this was to no avail. By the end of the summer all the militias in Holland had disbanded, and in August Barnevelt and Grotius were arrested and imprisoned.[8]

James's first intervention in the Dutch Arminian affair consisted of some cautious advice given in 1610 to the Dutch ambassadors at the English court. Advising the government of the Netherlands to silence the clergy and all public and pulpit disputes on the subject of predestination, he said:

> I have studied that subject as well as anybody, and have come to the conclusion that nothing certain can be laid down in regard to it. I have myself not always been of one mind about it, but I will bet that my opinion is the best of any, although I would not hang my salvation

---

[8]After the Synod of Dort, Barnevelt was sentenced to death, and Grotius to life imprisonment. Uytenbogaert was expelled from the ministry, but avoided physical punishment by resettling in Antwerp after Barnevelt's arrest. See ibid., pp. 295-99.

> upon it. My Lord the States would do well to order their doctors and teachers to be silent on this topic. I have hardly ventured, moreover, to touch upon the matter of justification in my own writings, because that also seemed to hang upon predestination.[9]

James's modesty aside, this position differed little from James's stand at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. There James had not admitted his own limitations so readily, but his vague answers certainly had implied conservatism if not confusion in regard to the disputed points. More important, James's advice also differed little from the policy that the States of Holland was attempting to enforce.[10]

But James's involvment in Dutch theological affairs was not limited to advising the ambassadors of the United Provinces of his private opinions. In 1611 one Conrad Vorst (Vorstius) was appointed to succeed Arminius at Leyden. Vorstius, before his call to Leyden a minister at Steinfurt, had written two controversial works entitled Tractatus Theologicus de Deo (1610) and Exegesis Apologetica (1611). Vorstius was an Arminian in terms of his predestination theology. But neither these works which consisted of a series of theses on the divine essence and attributes, nor

---

[9]"Rappart van den Heeren Gecommitteer den geweest hebbende in Engelandt in der jaere 1610." Unpublished Hague manuscript, quoted in Motley, I, 251.

[10]Scott, p. 46; and Harrison, Beginnings..., p. 160.

his apologetic treatise, A Christian and Moderate Answer (1611), dealt specifically with that topic.[11]

Vorstius's appointment did not go unopposed in Holland, and one Sibrandus Lubertius of Franeker took it upon himself to write to highly placed clergy in other countries for aid.[12] One of his correspondents was Archbishop Abbot who "most likely had already perused Vorstius's Tractatus Theologicus de Deo and his Exegesis Apologetica."[13] Abbot, anxious to root out any heresy wherever its location, immediately gave James this letter together with his own views on the subject. Thus began James's famous, if fruit-

---

[11]Although numerous quotations from the works are available, most particularly in James's Declaration Concerning His Proceedings with the States Generall of the United Provinces of the Low Countries in the Cause of D. Conradus Vorstius (1612), recent scholars variously label Vorstius Arian, Socinian, and atheist. H.J. McLachlan (Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England /London, 1951/, note, p. 37), says "Vorst's opinions appear to have been somewhat eclectic; a moderate Calvinism tinged with Socinian tolerance of divergent views would probably describe them." Henry Hallam (The Constitutional History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II /London, 1855/, I, note, p. 402), described Vorstius as "Arian." As the exact nature of Vorstius's "heresy" is not directly relevant to this study, no examination of his views will be attempted here.

[12]Lubertius did not stop with his letters to foreign courts. He propounded his views in a letter to the States General appended to the preface of his work, De Jesu Christo Servatore (1611) and to his work Ninety-nine Errors of Conradus Vorstius (1613) dedicated to Abbot.

[13]Paul Welsby, George Abbot, the Unwanted Archbishop 1562-1633 (London, 1962), p. 61.

less, involvement in the Vorstius affair.[14]

James's first step after reading the offending works was to instruct his ambassador at the Hague, Ralph Winwood, to protest the appointment to the States General. Winwood was directed to tell that body "that we doubt not, but that their Ambassadors...did informe them of a forewarning that We wished the said Ambassadors to make unto them in Our Names, to beware in time of seditious and hereticall Preachers, and not to suffer any such to creepe into their State. Our principal meaning was of Arminius, who though himself were lately dead, yet had he left too many of his disciples behind him."[15] Arminius was "of little better

---

[14]Fuller, (The Church History..., V, 414) makes no mention of either Lubertius's or Abbot's role, but uses the occasion to praise James's scholarly inclinations. Supposedly James came across Vorstius's works while hunting - "...he was so serious amidst his sports and recreations..." However, there is no doubt that Abbot brought the matter to James's attention for Ralph Winwood, the English ambassador at the Hague in 1610, wrote of Vorstius's works "being come to the notice of our Lord of Canterbury, out of the care he hath to preserve religion in its ancient purity and integrity, he hath so far prevailed with his Majesty, that from him I have had charge publicly to protest against the reception of this Vorstius." (Winwood to Mr. Trumbull, Resident of Brussels, Hague, October 9, 1611, Ralph Winwood, Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I /London, 1725/, III, 296.) Michael De La Roche (An Abridgment of Gerard Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low Countries /London, 1725/, II, 318) noted only that "some Reformed brought the Archbishop of Canterbury into their quarrel against Vorstius. Paul Welsby (p. 61) mentions Lubertius by name.

[15]James, His Majesties Declaration Concerning His Proceeding with the States General of the United Provinces of the Low Countries in the Cause of D. Conradus Vorstius (London, 1612), p. 4. In this work James reviews his

stuffe" than his successor, and "though himself bee dead, hath left his sting yet living among them."[16]

In fact James's warning in 1610 had not been against Arminius or his followers specifically, but against the dangers of permitting any kind of public dispute over predestination theology. James here, as he was frequently and dangerously inclined to do, was reinterpreting his own words to suit the occasion.

James also corresponded directly with the States General, again pointing out the Arminian roots of the Vorstius affair.

> We had well hoped, that the corrupt seed which that enemie of God Arminius did sowe amongst you some yeeres since...had given you a sufficient warning...[17]

James admitted that "it was Our hard hap not to heare of this Arminius before he was dead...," but had he known of Arminius and his heresy, he most certainly would have taken a firm stand against him.[18]

How strange this clear condemnation sounds when one recalls James's comment in 1610 - that he had studied the

---

involvement in the Vorstius affair. It contains detailed accounts of James's letters to the States General and to the States of Holland.

[16] _Ibid._, p. 5

[17] _Ibid._, p. 18.

[18] _Ibid._, p. 19.

subject in dispute and had "come to the conclusion that nothing certain can be laid down in regard to it".[19] Even Barnevelt (Oldenbarnevelt) was puzzled by the rather abrupt change in James's theology and policy. In October of 1611 he wrote to Caron:

> Sound well the gentleman you wot of, and other personages as to the conclusive opinions over there. The course of the propositions does not harmonize with what I have myself heard out of the King's mouth at other times, nor with the reports of former ambassadors. I cannot well understand that the King should with such preciseness, condemn all other opinion save those of Calvin and Beza.[20]

Barnevelt's effort to comprehend the royal theology led him to an investigation of the Barret controversy and Lambeth Articles. In 1612 he was to ask Caron, the Dutch ambassador to England, to find out "whether the nine points pressed in the year 1595 were accepted and published in 1603. If so, pray send them, as they may be made use of in settling our differences here."[21] Poor Barnevelt! The fate of those Lambeth Articles at the Hampton Court Conference of 1603 indeed was relevant to his own situation, but knowledge of

---

[19]Moreover in 1610 James had applauded an Erastian treatise written by Uytenbogaert (Harrison, Beginnings..., p. 140). Was he now to claim he had not known that Uytenbogaert was Arminius's successor as spiritual leader of the Arminians?

[20]Letter of October 3, 1611, quoted in Motley, I, 267.

[21]Letter of January 21, 1612, quoted in ibid., I, 272.

James's theology at home could only cloud understanding of James's theology abroad.

The attack on Vorstius was not merely a shadow behind which to hide a belated condemnation of Arminius. The English monarch so sincerely and fiercely opposed the academic appointment that even if it turned out that Vorstius was innocent of the charges laid against him, the States should find "some other, who shall not bee subject to that scandall wherewith hee is so tainted, as it must bee a long penance, and many yeeres of probation, that must weare it away!"[22]

This time James was not simply giving out free advice. He ended his letter to the States General with the threat that if the Dutch insisted upon the appointment, James, as Defender of the Faith, would be obliged "not only to depart and separate ourselves from the union of such false and hereticall Churches, but also to exhort all other reformed Churches to joyne with Us in a Common Councell, how to extinguish, and remaund to hell these abominable Heresies, that now newly begin to put foorth againe. And furthermore for Our owne particular, We shalbe enforced strictly to inhibite the youth of our Dominions from repairing to so infected a place, as is the Universitie of Leiden."[23]

---

[22] James, Declaration..., p. 21.

[23] Ibid., p. 23.

Vorstius and Arminius were not the only victims of James's ire. In 1610 Peter Bertius, a leading minister of Amsterdam and an old friend and colleague of Arminius, had written a work on the defectibility of grace entitled, Hymenaeus Desertor, sive Sanctorum Apostasia Problemata duo. Ignoring the advice of Isaac Casaubon,[24] a French scholar in exile, and at this time a favorite of James, Bertius sent Abbot a copy of his work in October of 1611. There is no record of Abbot's reply, but he obviously shared Bertius's work and correspondence with James, for the king denounced to the States General the audacity of the "scholler of the late Arminius (who was the first in our age that infected Leyden with Heresie)" to send to the English archbishop a book "the title whereof only were enough to make it worthy of the fire."[25]

As if to add force to his threat James had Vorstius's works burned publicly at Paul's Cross in London and at both universities. On November 5 Winwood appeared before the States of Holland to inform them that "the friendship of the

---

[24]In a letter to Bertius in September of 1611 Casaubon wrote: "Richard Thomson introduced your book to me, but I am no Theologian. I am occupied with reading the fathers; I admire their piety; novelties do not suit my taste... As for your book, if you had followed my advice you would never have sent it to the Archbishop. He is a very religious man, but of the opposite opinion." Quoted in Harrison, Beginnings..., pp. 180-81.

[25]James, Declaration..., pp. 14-16.

King and the heresy of Vorstius are quite incompatible."[26] At the same time he attempted to clarify the source of James's interest in the whole affair.

> ...and the succours which your provinces have received from his Crownes, by the deluge of blood, which his subjects have spent in your warres. Religion is the onely sowder of this Amitie: For his Majestie being, by the grace of God, Defender of the Faith (by which Title hee doth more value himselfe, then by the Title of King of Great Britaine) doth holde himselfe obliged to defend all those, who, professe the same Faith and Religion with him.[27]

The States of Holland met James's threats and Winwood's explanations with the promise that a full reply would be given after their next meeting in January 1619.[28] For his part, Vorstius wrote A Christian and Moderate Answer in reply to the charges against him.

But James still was not satisfied. In a tract entitled His Majestie's Declaration Concerning His Proceedings with the States Generall of the United Provinces of the Low Countreys, In the Cause of D. Conradus Vorstius (1612), he condemned Vorstius's apologetic work as making "...so light reckoning of his questions before-mentioned as if it were

---

[26]Winwood, III, 109. "Sir Ralph Winwood's Protestation in the Assembly of the States General Concerning Vorstius," December 9, 1611.

[27]James, Declaration..., pp. 35-36.

[28]Ibid., pp. 41-43.

but about the tale of Tobyes dogge."[29] Vorstius himself he labeled alternately "a wretched Heretique or rather Atheist," "monster," "viper," "wretched and wicked atheist," "worthy of the fagot."[30]

The main theme of the work however centered on James's own motives which he righteously enumerated as "the zeale of Gods glory," "charitie towards Our next neighbours and Allies," and "the just reason Wee had to feare the like infection within Our owne Dominions."[31]

James had good reason to be concerned that his motives would not be understood. In a series of letters to Caron, Barnevelt complained that James was doing more harm than good, and in one particular letter specified that the whole business was none of the English king's affair.

> ...but one cannot conceive here that the knowledge and judicature of the matter belongs anywhere else than to My Lords the States of Holland, in whose service he has legally been during four months before his Majesty made the least difficulty about it.[32]

It was not merely the interference that the Dutch statesman resented, but the arrogant and condescending tone of the English monarch. On one occasion Winwood had told Barnevelt

---

[29] Ibid., p. 46.

[30] Ibid., pp. 2, 3, 4, 16.

[31] Ibid., p. 46.

[32] Letter of January 28, 1612, quoted in Motley, I, 274. See also ibid., I, 271.

that if Leyden retained Vorstius "hys Maty had the meanes, yf yt pleased him to use them, and that without drawing swordes, to range them to rayson, and to make the Magistrates on their knees demand hys pardon..." Barnevelt replied that "he was borne in libertye, and therefore could not digest suche kynde of language; the kynge of spayne...did never speake in soe highe a style."[33]

Nevertheless in April of 1612 the Dutch did give in to the pressures against Vorstius's appointment to the extent that he was requested to move from Leyden to Gouda, and although he was retained as a professor at the University, he was not to lecture there.[34] James, who would have nothing less than the removal of Vorstius from the Provinces, remained dissatisfied.

Few historians have attempted to understand James's overreaction to Vorstius. Fuller completely accepted James and Winwood at their word - that James's concern rose "from the pure Fountaine of his religious Heart..."[35] C.H. McIlwain in his introduction to The Political Works of James

---

[33]The conversation was recounted by Winwood in a letter to Viscount Rochester, April 7, 1612. The letter is reprinted in the appendix of Motley, II, 459.

[34]After the Synod of Dort he was dismissed from his professorship, and expelled from Gouda (Harrison, Beginnings..., p. 187).

[35]Earl of Salisbury to Winwood, Whitehall, December 29, 1611, Winwood, III, 317. See also Fuller, The Church History..., V, 414ff.

I is a bit more skeptical. He suggests two possible explanations, both of which are plausible. First, "it may be suspected that even the 'heresy' of Vorstius was hateful largely because of its author's belief in parity."[36]

In his Declaration James had charged that Vorstius "sweepes away next all manner of power both Aristocraticall and Democraticall from the Church, cleane contrarie to the Apostles institution, which ordeineth, that the spirits of the Prophets should be subject to the Prophets."[37] This charge, oddly enough, was based on a comment Vorstius had made to defend himself rather than to assert a particular theory of church government.

> Neither are many men alwayes richer (in knowledge) then some one man. Let not therefore any one man arrogate all things to himselfe. Nor let the greater multitude envie a particular man, for having some singularity more than his fellowes.[38]

What Vorstius meant becomes irrelevant to what James understood when he read the words. To James "parity" meant anabaptist and the destruction of church authority, only a small step from the destruction of monarchical authority. James's dealings with the Puritans in England to a great

---

[36] C.H. McIlwain, (ed.), The Political Works of James I (Cambridge, 1948), p. xci.

[37] James, Declaration..., p. 61.

[38] Conrad Vorstius, A Christian and Modest Answere (1611), p. 3 of Preface.

extent were based upon this fear of parity in church government.

It is difficult to connect logically James's fears in regard to ecclesiastical policy with his relatively specific enumerations of Vorstius's theological heresies. But as further examination of James's dealings with the Dutch and with the Puritans at home will illustrate,[39] James seldom if ever dealt with theology, and with predestination theology in particular, for its own sake. In spite of his reputation, a reputation that he carefully fostered, James was not a theologian. He was most honest when he admitted to the Dutch ambassadors that he could not really commit himself on the predestination issue, a discreet way of admitting incompetence. Sadly that occasion was not often repeated. Instead James tended to take strong theological positions, not on their own merit, but for reasons of personal bias, reasons of state, or for the one really strong religious commitment James had, i.e., episcopal church government. The main weakness with the "parity" explanation lies in the fact that neither the Remonstrants nor the contra-Remonstrants questioned the presbyterian polity of the Dutch church. There was no reason for James to get so involved in a polity issue that in the Netherlands was no issue at all.

---

[39] See Chapter V of this study.

More visible, but not completely worked out, is McIlwain's thesis that James's attack on Vorstius was a means of exemplifying his own orthodoxy - particularly in the face of his pro-Spanish foreign policy.[40] In fact James went further than asserting his own orthodoxy as a Protestant. He envisioned himself as defender of a faith that far exceeded the boundaries of Great Britain. In his role as "protector of the orthodox," he went so far as to portray himself, if not imagine himself, as defending even the Roman church against the dangerous heresies of Vorstius. In a conversation with the Venetian ambassador on March 9, 1612 he said of his Declaration, "he had defended therein the faith that is called Roman quite as much as any other creed of Christians."[41]

But basically James saw himself as the "Protestant Pope," protector of Protestantism from the evil wiles of Vorstius and Rome alike. Three weeks after the above conversation was reported to Venice, Foscarini, the Venetian ambassador, informed his superiors that James was convinced that Vorstius was a pawn of Spain and the Jesuits, who would ruin the Dutch by internal treachery since they had failed

---

[40] McIlwain, pp. xxxi-xxxii.

[41] Antonio Foscarini to Doge and Senate, London, March 9, 1612, Calendar of State Papers Venetian, 1610-1613, p. 306.

to do so by military force.[42]

Of course James's claims as "defender of the faith" were absurd in the face of the support he had given the Netherlands in their struggle against Spain. Common religion was set aside in the face of James's desire to conclude a separate peace with Spain -- a peace that came five years before the Twelve Year Truce between Spain and the Netherlands.[43] Common religious bonds were set aside in the face of James's overwhelming fear of rebellion in any form, and his consequent peculiar notion of what constituted Dutch sovereignty. Common religious interests aside, it was not to England's political interests to have Spain freed of her Dutch war, and not to England's commercial interests to have the Netherlands released from a war economy.[44]

Thus ultimately for James, religious interests came

---

[42]Foscarini to Doge and Senate, London, March 30, 1612, ibid., p. 320. James was very puzzled by the unfavorable truce which Spain had made with the Netherlands in 1609. According to Foscarini, James believed that only some Spanish plot to undermine the Dutch could account for Spain's willingness to accept that truce.

[43]By this treaty (1604) James promised to lend no assistance to the Dutch. They could still recruit in England, but a like privilege was extended to the Spanish. (G. Edmundson, Anglo-Dutch Rivalry During the First Half of the Seventeenth Century /Oxford, 1911/, p. 16.)

[44]Sir Charles Cornwallis to Earl of Salisbury (undated), Winwood, II, 323; Lord Cecil to Winwood, Court at Winchester, October 3, 1603, ibid., II, 7; Zorzi Giustinian to Doge and Senate, London, April 25, 1607, C.S.P.V., 1603-07, p. 278; Antonio Foscarini to Doge and Senate, London, March 30, 1612, C.S.P.V., 1607-10, p. 195.

after reasons of state, personal fears, and Spanish friendship. But religion did have its place. In the Vorstius affair James was able to act out his fancy as "defender of the faith" without jeopardizing any of his other interests. Indeed it provided a convenient opportunity to do so.

More important for this study is James's attack on Arminius in 1611 and 1612. Certainly there is no evidence of a theological change in James. He attacked the Arminians without making any specific references to the theological points at issue in the Dutch controversy. In the Declaration James limited himself to an aside at the title of Bertius's book (Hymenaeus Desertor, sive Sanctorum Apostasia Problemata duo),[45] and to the following general statement on predestination.

> Let the secrets of God alone, and bee not too curious to inquire into heaven.
>
> The nature of man through the transgression of our first parents hath lost free will and retaineth not any shadow thereof, saving an inclination to evill, those onely excepted and purged from this originall Leprosie. Insomuch as it is a very perilous thing to set abroach these new and dangerous questions, although they be accompanied with good answers. For the greatest part of the world following the footsteps of our first Parents are naturally inclined to choose the evill, and to leave that

---

[45] James, Declaration..., pp. 15-16.

which is good...[46]

Historians who have not accepted James on face value have tended to follow Grotius's interpretation of James's change of heart as due to the one-sided reports of Winwood and the Calvinist Abbot.[47] Indeed examination of Winwood's letters shows no effort on the ambassador's part to present the Remonstrants as anything less than a seditious sect. Moreover it was Winwood who first slurred distinctions between the Vorstius affair and the Arminian dispute in Holland.[48] An ardent enemy of the Arminians in general and Vorstius in particular, Winwood had no trouble following up James's letters to the States General; in fact on at least one occasion he went too far even for James who charged Winwood with "exceeding your Commission."[49]

The thesis in regard to the Abbot-Winwood influence is further supported by the facts that Abbot was not in a position to exert influence in 1610 when James took his neutral position (he was appointed archbishop in January of 1611), and in the three years between Winwood's return and

---

[46] Ibid., p. 55

[47] See Willson, p. 240; Harrison, Beginnings..., p. 202; and R.W. Lee, Hugo Grotius (London, 1930), p. 21.

[48] Winwood to Mr. Trumbull, Resident of Brussels, The Hague, October 9, 1611, Winwood, III, 296.

[49] Mr. John More to Winwood, London, January 1, 1611, ibid., III, 319. Winwood had threatened that if the Dutch persisted in the Vorstius appointment, they would be breaking the Anglo-Dutch Alliance which was based on common religion.

Dudley Carleton's appointment to the Hague, James again withdrew into a neutral corner.

It should not be inferred that the task of moving James was an easy one. James himself evidenced a reluctance to enter into an outright attack on the Arminians. In 1611 Winwood was instucted that if the States responded positively to James's letter protesting the appointment of Vorstius, the ambassador should not "enter into Speech concerning Arminius and his Sectaries, seeing that the mention thereof was renewed at this time only by occasion of the other, and may be urged hereafter more seasonably when his Master shall think fit."[50] "More seasonably" obviously meant when James was in a better financial situation. He had just dismissed the "addled" Parliament; the Great Contract had been dissolved, and James was facing the budgetary problems that were to plague his entire reign. The Dutch entered the financial picture insofar as James held the cautionary towns of Flushing, Brille, and Rammekens as pledges of repayment for the vast sums of money Elizabeth had advanced the Netherlands during their struggle with Spain. James explicitly mentioned hopes of financing himself through the repayment of this loan in his above mentioned censure of Winwood:

...the Protest was made at an

---

[50] Earl of Salisbury to Winwood, Whitehall, November 5, 1611, ibid., III, 301.

> unseasonable Time, when he was to receive Kindness (namely Reimbursement of Money) at the States Hands...[51]

Torn between his financial-political interests and his legitimate concern with heresy, James needed some outside force to influence him in a course of action. The Arminians were at a disadvantage not only because of the accessibility Winwood and Abbot had to the English monarch, but also because of their position as theological innovators and faction makers within their church. Well versed in the religio-political struggles of Scotland, James was an ardent opponent of public disputes over religion, disputes for which the innovators all too easily could be held responsible.[52] Fully aware of James's view that religious discord was the fertile womb of political chaos and revolution,[53] Winwood kept James aware of every turbulence involving the Arminians.[54]

But despite his fear of religious strife, and perhaps because of his financial situation, James's conversion to the Winwood-Abbot outlook on the Dutch Arminians was not

---

[51]Mr. John More to Winwood, London, January 1, 1611, ibid., III, 319.

[52]Already in November of 1611 James, via Cecil, referred to the Arminians as "Sectaries." Earl of Salisbury to Winwood, Whitehall, November 5, 1611, ibid., III, 301.

[53]See Cardwell, Documentary Annals..., I, note p. 64.

[54]Harrison, Beginnings..., p. 199.

complete. In 1613, still hamstrung for lack of money, he responded positively to the efforts of Caron, Uytenbogaert and Barnevelt to return him to his 1610 position.

In December of 1612 Caron, the Dutch ambassador to England, returned to the Hague for conferences with Uytenbogaert and Barnevelt. A translation of the five articles of the Remonstrants, a letter describing the differences between the two conflicting parties, and a "model letter" for James to follow in his reply were drawn up and delivered to James by Caron.[55]

On March 6, 1613 James wrote the States General:

> We inform you of what experience has taught us, that such differences are rarely to be decided by the conferences of Divines; but that it is much more proper to put an end to them by publick authority, forbidding your Clergy to touch upon such disputes in the pulpit, or among the common people; and strictly requiring them to preserve peace by a mutual toleration of the differing opinions which each side has embraced concerning those points; at least so long till it shall be otherwise appointed by the aforesaid publick authority, after due cognizance of

---

[55]There is some problem as to the authorship of the model letter. Harrison (Beginnings..., pp. 199-200) follows the Dutch biographer of Uytenbogaert, Rogge, in attributing the letter to Uytenbogaert. G.P. van Itterzoon, ("Konig Jacobus I en de Synode van Dordrecht," Ned. Arch. voor Kerkgeschiedenis, XXIV [1932], 193) also attributes the letter to Uytenbogaert. Brandt (II, 123) notes that Grotius was accused of being the author. Grotius denied this. Nevertheless there are many parallels between James's 1613 letters and Grotius's own description of, and prescription for, the Arminian controversy.

> matters. And we think we have so much the more reason to exhort you to this, for as much as having sent in a certain Letter sent Us by the Heer Caron, your Ambassador, the opinions of both parties, and the reasons which they found those opinions, very largely discussed; We do not perceive either of them to be so absurd as not to consist with the truth of the Christian faith, as well as with the salvation of mens souls.[56]

According to Abbot, James had "in no way altered in Judgment concerning Arminius..."; his assertion that "both opinions might consist with the Truth of Christianity and with the Salvation of Men's Souls" was a result of the Caron letter which according to Abbot "was captiously and cautelously set down."[57]

But James was not one to be ensnared by theology or clever correspondence. The Arminian letters aside, by 1613 James's debt had risen to £680,000; £125,000 was due for money borrowed in 1612, and £67,000 of the anticipated revenue of 1614 was already spent. "The decay in public

---

[56] Quoted in Brandt, II, 129.

[57] Archbishop Abbot to Winwood, Lambeth, May 5, 1613, Winwood, III, 451-52. Motley (I, 349) notes that James's "astounding inconsistency was a matter very indifferent to all but himself..." Willson (p. 399) ignores the inconsistencies implying that James's policy did not change between 1610 and 1617. Harrison (Beginnings..., pp. 199-200), like Abbot, stresses the influence of the letters brought by Caron. None of these historians has considered the connection between James's relations with his Parliaments in regard to finances and his Dutch policy.

finance had turned to dead rot."[58] Consequently James was highly susceptible to a theological position that would increase the likelihood of repayment of the Dutch debt. In 1612-13 Barnevelt and his friends were still in the ascendant insofar as political power was concerned.- (Holland was still the most influential single power in the States General). They controlled the purse strings which James was so anxious to loosen; and the fact of their political power quieted James's fear that he would be lending support to a rebellious minority faction.

Moreover it did not require hypocrisy for James to advocate secular arbitration of theological quarrels; he was Erastian in affairs of church and state, and handled the Puritan problem in much the same way he would now have the Dutch handle their religious difficulties.

Aware of the precariousness of their position with James, the Dutch Arminians attempted to solidify the new support from James by sending Grotius to England ostensibly as part of a commission to discuss freedom of navigation and commerce in the Indian Seas, but more importantly, to further influence James in their favour.

Grotius was an excellent choice for the mission. Because of his correspondence with Isaac Casaubon, he was not only known to James, but on one occasion had been

---

[58] Willson, p. 344.

praised by him. In 1612 Grotius had written to Casaubon suggesting a confessional union of Protestant churches arrived at through a council under the presidency of James.[59] Casuabon had showed the correspondence to the king who praised the plan, but who was unable to take the initiative on such a synod at that time.[60] With this introduction Grotius arrived in England at the end of March 1613.[61]

---

[59] Such a union was one of James's pet dreams. See Brandt, II, 153 regarding a similar plan presented to James by Peter du Moulin.

[60] P.C. Molhuysen, ed. Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius (Gravehage, 1928), I, 196.

[61] There is a question about the arrival date of Grotius and the commission. The official history of the Synod of Dort claimed that Grotius was in England before the March 6 letter; that, in fact, he brought a copy of that letter as a model for James's own. And afterward he "surreptitiously obtained and transmitted" the letters to the States General and to the States of Holland. See Scott, p. 57. In a footnote Scott adds that the above account was published before James's death, and "it must be presumed he was willing to have it thought that these letters were surreptitiously obtained by Grotius." As James was to reverse himself again in 1617, this charge against Grotius was most convenient. But the arrival date of the commission can be established through Casaubon's diary as early April. Moreover, the Venetian ambassador to the court of James mentions Grotius's visit in his report of April 11, 1613 (Antonio Foscarini to Doge and Senate, London, C.S.P.V., 1610-13, pp. 520-21). It would be unlike the observant Venetians to let the visit go unnoted for a month or more. With the possible exception of Mark Pattison (Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614 /London, 1875/, p. 306) who writes that Grotius was in London in March and April 1613, historians have dated Grotius's arrival after James's March letter. Harrison (Beginnings..., p. 200) gives the date as March 31; Lee (p. 19) as "the end of March"; and Vreeland (p. 64) notes that the States General did not pass the resolution to send the commission until March 15, 1613.

Grotius stayed in England for almost two months. During that time he not only had his audience with James, but also with the aid of Casaubon, established relations with English churchmen favorably disposed toward the Arminian theology. These churchmen included Lancelot Andrewes, then Bishop of Ely, John Overall, Dean of St. Paul's and John Richardson, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. The details of their positions on predestination theology, and their relationships with Grotius are dealt with in the next chapter. In the present context, the major question is the success of Grotius's mission.

Grotius's own account of his interview with James was very optimistic. In a letter to Barnevelt he wrote

> I have seen the King and spoken with him for two hours over our disputes. Caron had warned me that H.M. was somewhat ill affected by communications from Winwood and the Archbishop, and Casaubon tells me that I am discredited with the Archbishop. But finding H.M. well disposed, I discussed with him the diverse views entertained on the questions of predestination etc. Then we came to the subject of the claims of the clergy. I convinced him that the Contraremonstrants are Puritans. I explained your intentions to H.M., viz. that the writings of Calvin etc., shall not take the place of Papal Decretals. I tried to remove H.M.'s bad impression of your brother, (Elias Barnevelt, Pensionary of Rotterdam, died 21 July 1612), van der Myle (Cornelius van der Myle, Barnevelt's son-in-law), and Uytenbogaert. I praised H.M.'s letters of 6 and 21 March to the States

General and to the States of Holland.[62]

Grotius also related discussions with James on the differences between application and acquisition of salvation, illustrating the Arminian doctrine of universal grace by a general pardon which Parliament might proclaim, yet every man had to come in and claim the benefit for himself.[63]

Abbot, to say the least, was far less optimistic about the impression made by Grotius. "At his first coming to the King, by reason of his good Latine Tongue, he was so tedious and full of tittle tattle, that the King's Judgment was of him, that he was some Pedant, full of Words and of no great Judgment.[64] Abbot further related to Winwood that in taking leave of James, Grotius "fell into Discourse what a famous Church was here in England; what worthy Men the Bishops were, how he admitted the ecclesiasticall Government; what great Contentment he received by Conference with many learned Men: But, saith he, I do perceive that your great Men do not all agree in those Questions now controverted amongst us; for in talking with my Lord of Ely, I perceive that he is of Opinion that a Man that is truly justifyed and sanctifyed, may excidere a

---

[62]Quoted in Lee, pp. 20-21.

[63]Harrison, Beginnings..., p. 202. No citation of original source given.

[64]Abbot to Winwood, Lambeth, June 1, 1613, Winwood, III, 459.

gratia, although not finaliter yet totaliter."[65]

Moreover Grotius cemented Abbot's hostility toward him with his parting remark that "his Majesty had Information but of one side," that Winwood "did deal partially, making all Reports in Favour of the one side, and saying nothing at all for the other." If he had been a truly objective observer of the conflict, he would have informed James of "how factious a Generation these Contradictors are; how they are like to our Puritans in England; how refractory they are to the Authority of the Civill Magistrate,..."[66]

The ultimate effectiveness of Grotius's visit is a moot if interesting point. It is impossible to determine whether James's subsequent moves were motivated by a desire to establish himself further with those who then held the Dutch purse strings, or by a sincere admiration for Grotius. Either way, in a letter to the States of Holland and West Friesland in May, James reaffirmed his new position on the Dutch controversy by condemning the recent publication of two of Whitaker's orations and the Lambeth Articles "which had never before been consented to, or published in England, and the publication of which was even prohibited..." In the same letter he also protested against the comment of some contra-Remonstrant ministers who had said in reference

---

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid., III, 460.

to James's endorsement of civil arbitration of theological disputes: "there /is/ a great difference between the Monarchical Government of that Prince, and this of the States General."[67]

James also responded positively to the Edict of 1613 which was mainly the work of Grotius. According to Casaubon, "that religious King and other very great Men have not only approved of these Counsels, but likewise of the Formulary drawn up by the States." James applauded the effort to restrain men's curiosities "that they may not any longer think above what they ought, nor any more disturb the peace of the Church, and by their abominable pragmaticalness, give occasion to the enemies of the Truth to blacken the Professors of the Reformed religion with the imputation of disorder and novelty."[68]

There is no reason to doubt James's sincerity in praising the Edict, for in his praise of it he repeated the main point he had made at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 - the mysteries of God should not be inquired into and debated by common Christians, for such inquiry and debate could only disturb the peace of the Church and ultimately, the peace of the kingdom. If Grotius had achieved anything

---

[67]Quoted in Brandt, II, 125. This last incident referred to troubles in the Classis of Alkmaer. The comment was made by ministers of some villages to commissioners sent by the States of Holland.

[68]Quoted in ibid., II, 141.

in his conversation with James, it was possibly to have "convinced" him that the Arminians were not innovators bent on disturbing the peace of the Church. But lest too much be granted to Grotius, and too little to James, it must be remembered that James was not thus convinced without an eye to a possible escape route from his financial problems.

By 1617 that escape route no longer existed. And driven by new forces, James reversed himself, this final time in favor of the contra-Remonstrants. Again theology played a minor role. In 1616, having failed to get any financial assistance from the Parliament of 1614, and consequently desperate for money, James accepted £250,000 for the restitution of the cautionary towns which he had held for a debt of £750,000.[69]

Desperate as he was, James was not likely to feel kindly disposed toward Barnevelt, the Dutch author of the arrangement that not only released the Netherlands from the political complication of English sovereignty on Dutch soil, but also netted them a tidy sum in free aid. Moreover a healthy soil in which James's hostility toward Barnevelt

---

[69]Never one to color James's motives with dirty green, John Rushworth (Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in Law, Remarkable Proceedings... /London, 1722/, I, 3) claimed that James gave up the towns in order to keep good relations with Spain and the Netherlands. Spain, claiming propriety of the towns was pushing James hard for their release into Spanish hands. But "such was the Kings care and contrivance to keep faith with those confederates, and not offend Spain," that he was willing to take such a great financial loss!

could grow had already been established. First of all, as champion of the Dutch peace party in 1609, Barnevelt was a natural opponent of James who had favored a continuation of the Dutch struggle. Moreover, adding insult to injury, James, in spite of his pretensions as peacemaker of Europe,[70] was not invited to mediate the Spanish-Dutch truce. Indeed it was concealed from him because of his known interest "to blow the Coales of War, not to quench them."[71] Finally, Barnevelt's reaction to the change in James's policy in 1611-12 did not endear him to the English monarch. In the process of expressing his own confusion at the sudden change in James's Dutch policy, Barnevelt tended to point out the inner contradictions of that policy. In a letter to Caron in January of 1612 Barnevelt, referring to the contra-Remonstrants as Puritans, wrote:

> We wonder the more because they are endeavoring, in ecclesiastical matters at least, to usurp an extraordinary authority against which his Majesty, with very weighty reasons, has so many times declared his opinion founded upon God's Word, and upon all laws and principles of justice.[72]

But the overwhelming motivating force behind James's new and final switch in alliances lay in the political fact

---

[70] Willson, pp. 271ff.

[71] Sir Charles Cornwallis to Earl of Salisbury (undated), Winwood, II, 323.

[72] Quoted in Motley, I, 270.

that by 1617 the balance of power in the Netherlands had shifted in favor of the contra-Remonstrants; and the new English ambassador, Dudley Carleton, had little difficulty convincing James that the Arminians were "breeding disunion."[73]

Dudley Carleton had been appointed to replace Winwood in 1615 with the instructions "not to forget that you are the minister of that master whom God hath made the sole protector of his religion...and you may let fall how hateful the maintaining of erroneous opinions is to the majesty of God and how displeasing to us."[74] To say the least, Carleton took these instructions very seriously. More ardent even than Winwood in his opposition to the Arminians (on both political and religious grounds), he not only fed James's suspicions that the Arminians were indeed heretical rebels, but also kept alive Maurice's growing hostility to the Arminians and their Dutch leader.[75]

In January of 1617 Carleton noted that Barnevelt was diligently working "to encrease" his authority "by introducing these new opinions, and creating magistrates in all places that way affected," and to add a bit more sting to the threat of theological innovation he put the whole

---

[73] Carleton, Letters..., p. 194.

[74] Ibid., p. 6.

[75] Lee, p. 31.

Arminian affair into a Spanish-Catholic context.

> ...those places where popery is most frequent, as Utrecht for a province, and Rotterdam for town, the remonstrants are absolute, and generally the papists hold with that faction. Some conjecture (and this is his excellency's opinion) that all this is done by mons. Barnevelt by way of preparative against the time, when the renewing of the truce, of changing it to a peace, shall be brought into treaty, wherein it being likely the king of Spain will insist upon mitigation of the first article concerning the sovereignty of this government, and upon toleration of popish religion in these provinces...[76]

Carleton not only heated the coals under James and Maurice, but seriously countered the Arminian argument that they were the "Establishment" of the Netherlands, and their opponents, the "Puritans" - an argument that had some validity in so far as James's Erastianism was concerned. Relating a conversation with Barnevelt on this point he wrote to Winwood, I "let him know, that those, who are termed Puritans in England, cannot be so called here; they being there so esteemed, because they oppose the received and settled church-government. But here their church consists only of such , who may be as well stiled good protestants as those in France, or other reformed churches; and these we account to concur with our church in pro-

---

[76]Dudley Carleton to Winwood, The Hague, January 10/24 1617, Carleton, Letters..., p. 89.

fession..."[77]

By March of 1617 the reports of Carleton, the hostility James had for Barnevelt, and the loyalty he felt for Maurice, combined with the absence of any economic-political force working to the contrary, effected a change in James's policy.[78] On March 10 of that year James wrote the States General advising that a National Synod be called for arbitrating the differences between the two parties. Glossing over the ecclesiastical polity implications of such a

---

[77]Dudley Carleton to Winwood, The Hague, February 18/28 1617, ibid., p. 100. Edmundson (p. 42) blames James rather than Carleton. "Sir D. Carleton, acting on the King's instructions, did his utmost to bring about the great statesman's [Barnevelt] downfall and to support his enemies in compassing his death."

[78]F.E. Pamp ("Studies in the Origins of English Arminianism" [unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951], pp. 270-71) argues that Grotius's Ordinum Pietas was responsible for James's switch in 1617. In 1613 James was able to separate the issue of Vorstius from the Arminian question , but when Grotius wrote the above tract in defense of Vorstius, he rejoined the two questions "confirming for James that the heresy of the Arminians was inseparable from the Socinianism of Vorstius. This move cost Oldenbarnevelt his head, and Grotius, his country." In my opinion this thesis grants too much to the influence of Grotius. If the letters of 1613 had convinced James that the Arminian question and Vorstius were two separate issues, why would Grotius's defense of Vorstius have such an effect? Why did James not specifically mention Vorstius in his letter of 1617 if he was the vital factor in James's change of policy? Moreover, Grotius's Ordinum Pietas was not simply a defense of Vorstius. It was a general defense of state arbitration of religious dissension - a view that Erastian James shared as late as December of 1613, three months after the work was published (September 1613). Altogether Pamp makes too much of Grotius's influence, and of the intellectual, theological basis for James's Arminian policy.

synod and ignoring the fact that it would be controlled by Calvinist clergy, James compared it to his own Hampton Court Conference[79] which to his strange mind had established religious unity.

Again there is no evidence of a theological conversion. As late as December James had expressed agreement with the position that the controversy involved "only the Speculation of Divines," that "it appeared to him a very bold attempt for men to dispute so nicely about such questions of God's PREDESTINATION, and so preemptorily to decide matters, as if they had been in heaven, and had assisted at the Divine Council-board."[80]

James waited six months for a reply to his March letter. Then in October, Carleton made a devasting attack on the Remonstrants before the States General. The Remonstrants had used "craftie subtilties" to pass the Edict of 1613 in Holland,[81] and had used the excuse of provincial sovereignty in matters of religion not to maintain the "pure and sincere Religion," but "for the authorisation and

---

[79] Calender of State Papers Domestic, 1611-18, p. 504.

[80] John Overall to Grotius, June 20, 1617, recounting a conversation he had had with James the preceding December. Quoted in Brandt, II, 313.

[81] Dudley, Carleton, The Speech of Sir Dudley Carleton, Lord Ambassadour for the King of Great Britaine (London, 1618), p. 7.

allowance of new and strange opinions."[82] Now it had to be decided which of the two theologies most conformed to the Word of God, and the only way to do this was through the religious authorities.

> To carry this authoritie to the temporall Magistrate, giving to Caesar that which belongs to Caesar, were to leane and incline too much of that side, and to take from God that which is Gods.[83]

Not only should a synod be called, but it should be a national synod, i.e., one that Carleton as well as James knew, but did not publicly state, would destroy the political base of the Arminian party.

> I say Nationall, because the evill being passed from Province to Province a Provincial Synode is not sufficient. This is the Remedy...which is recommended to you by the King my Master.[84]

The Arminian response to Carleton's attack came in the form of an anonymous pamphlet[85] entitled The Balance. This pamphlet pointed out the contradictions between James's domestic policy (he had not called a synod after the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 in spite of the requests for

---

[82] Ibid.

[83] Carleton was clever enough to avoid getting involved in the federation vs. confederation problem - one that he, as an Englishman, could claim no great understanding of.

[84] Carleton, The Speech..., p. 6.

[85] The author has been identified by many historians as Taurinus of Utrecht.

one), and the solution which Carleton, in James's name, advocated for the Dutch. The author noted that the English Church itself was not free of criticism from the advocates of "high" Calvinistic predestination theology. And he seriously questioned the right of Carleton to interfere in Dutch domestic questions - what if Caron were to interfere similarly with England's religious problems which were, by no means, lacking in number?

Carleton attempted to answer the charge that in England religious controversy was settled by the temporal power. He claimed that the king did not himself resolve such controversy. He called the synod consisting of ecclesiastical persons, set the time and place, and gave them letters patent to debate and decide the matter at stake. "This is done by them alone, or separately in the place where they meet, without the interposition of any Lay-person."[86] Carleton might have gotten away with this explanation except that he also gave an account of the Hampton Court Conference "which...did not much agree with books published in England, about that matter, which had been translated into Dutch."[87]

As for the other charges in The Balance, Carleton claimed that the king's honor had been offended; he insisted

---

[86]Quoted in Brandt, II, 447.

[87]Ibid.

that the author be found and punished and the pamphlet be forbidden publication. In spite of his efforts, the pamphlet was illegally translated into French and widely read. Its author was never found.[88]

Whatever Carleton's success or lack of it in defending his speech, James's new policy stood, and after numerous delays the Synod was called to meet at Dort in November of 1618.[89] Great Britain, France, Hesse, Bremen and Geneva were invited to be represented. Displeased with the response to their intercession on behalf of Barnevelt, the French declined to attend. Thus the only Protestant kingdom in Europe that sent deputies to Dort was Great Britain.[90]

The English delegates included George Carleton, bishop of Llandaff, Joseph Hall, Bishop of Worcester who became ill and subsequently was replaced by Thomas Goad,

---

[88] See ibid., II, 393, 447 and Harrison, Arminianism, p. 73.

[89] Itterzoon (p. 187) claims that James influenced the choice of Dort as the meeting place by eliminating Utrecht and Hague which since the Vorstius affair James considered "prone to mutiny and rebellion."

[90] "The rest of the members of the Synod, with the exception of the Dutch Divines and those from Geneva and Switzerland, were the delegates of a few inconsiderable States in Germany; in which extensive empire, the Lutherans constituted about three-fourths of the Protestant population, but deputed no Divines to Dort." James Nichols, Calvinism and Arminianism Compared in their Principles and Tendencies (London, 1824), I, note p. 6. Although Nichols is highly biased against the Synod, the above note is true.

doctor of Divinity and chaplain to George Abbot, Walter Balcanqual, a Scottish Episcopalian and chaplain to James, Samuel Ward, archdeacon of Taunton, and John Davenant, professor of theology at Cambridge.[91] Also present was John Hales, chaplain to Dudley Carleton, whose letters together with those of Balcanqual provide the major source for the English account of the Synod.

James sent off his delegation with the following instructions.

> Our will and pleasure is that from this time forward upon all occasions

---

[91]Four of the six seem to have had prior sympathy with the contra-Remonstrant position. Thomas Goad, son of Roger Goad who had had a major role in the Baro and Overall affairs at Cambridge, was a chaplain to Robert Abbot who, like his brother, was committed to the orthodox theology of predestination. Samuel Ward had once "confided" in his diary his sorrow at the deaths of Whitaker and Perkins. John Davenant had attacked Arminius previously, and was admired by D'Ewes who was a violent opponent of the Arminians whom he styled "the heretical faction of the Anabaptists under the new and false name of Arminians" (The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes /London, 1845/, I, 97). Morris Fuller (The Life, Letters, and Writings of John Davenant, D.D. 1572-1641, Lord Bishop of Salisbury /London, 1897/, p. 59) points out that Davenant was an advocate of the doctrine of universal redemption, and consequently was supposed "by some men to have Arminian tendencies." And George Carleton had written a treatise in refutation of Arminius a year before the meeting of the Synod (Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1611-18, p. 489).

Interestingly, no representatives of the Dutch Church in England were invited to participate in the Synod. (They were invited to observe.) Itterzoon (p. 187) interprets this as an effort on the part of the Netherlanders to conciliate James. The Dutch churches in England tended to be presbyterian in church form, a form that was repugnant to Scottish born and bred James.

you inure yorselvs to the practise of the Latin tongue that when there is cause you may deliver yor mindes with the more readinesse and facility.

You shall in all points to be debated and disputed resolve among yorselves before hand what is ye true state of ye question, and joyntly and uniformly agree ther-upon.

And if in debating of the cause by the learned men there, any thing be emergent wherof you thought not before, you shall meete and consult thereupon againe, and so resolve among yorselvs joyntly what is fit to be maintained. And this is to be don agreeable to the scriptures and the doctrine of the churche of England.

Yor advise shall be to those churches that theire ministers do not deliver in the pulpit to the people these things for ordinary doctrines which are the highest points of schooles, and not fit for vulgar capacity, but disputable on bothe sides.

That they use no innovation in doctrin but teache the same things which were taught 20 or 30 yeares past in their owne Churches. And especially that which contradicteth not theire own confessions so long since published and knowen unto the world.

That they conform themselves to the publick Confessions of the neighbor reformed churches, with whom to hould good correspondence shall be no dishonor to them.

That if theire be maine opposition betweene any who are overmuche addicted to theire owne opinions, yor

endevor shall be that certaine positions be moderatly layed down, which may tend to the mitigacion of that on both sides.

That as you principally looke to Gods glory and the peace of those distracted churches so you have an eye to yor honor who send and imploye you thither, and consequently at all times consult with yor Embassador there residing, who is both acquainted with the forme of these countryes, understandeth well the questions and differences among them. And shall from time to time receive yor Princely directions as occasion shall require.

Finally in all other things which we can not forsee you shall carry yorselves with that advise, moderation and direction as to persons of yor quality and gravity shall appertaine.[92]

Each divine received £10 sterling a day, and was ordered by James to give a weekly account (each one in his several week according to seniority) of the proceedings at the Synod.[93]

The Synod began on November 3 of 1618. The Arminians

---

[92]Itterzoon, Appendix, p. 203.

[93]Although these reports were sent, they have not been preserved. The official English report of the Synod is contained in The Judgement of the Synode Holden at Dort, Concerning the five Articles: As also Their Sentence Touching Conradus Vorstius (London, 1619). A later report was published under the title of The Collegiat Suffrage of the Divines of Great Britaine, Concerning the Five Articles Controverted in the Low Countries, which Suffrage was by Them Delivered in the Synod of Dort, March 6, Anno 1619. Being Their Vote or Voice Forgoing the Joint and Publique Judgment of that Synod (London, 1629).

did not arrive until December 6, and in the interim the foreign delegates were presented to the Synod (the English by Dudley Carleton); a new translation of the Bible was considered; abbreviated forms of the Heidelberg Catechism and other such practical matters were discussed.

On the 29th of November, John Hall gave a "polite and pathetical Latin Sermon" exhorting the Synod to stand by their former theological determinations for "it was an especial part of his Maejesties Commission to exhort them to keep unaltered the former Confessions."[94] This condemnation of the Remonstrant theology before their arrival at the Synod bothered the fair John Hales who commented: "How fit it was to open so much of their Commission, and thus to express themselves for a Party against the Remonstrants your Honour can best judge."[95]

Hall was not alone in his prejudgment of the Remonstrants. In fact the whole synod was arranged not as a conference wherein religious differences were to be worked out, but as a court in which the Remonstrants were to be judged. There were one hundred and five delegates, seventy-nine of whom were delegates from the United Provinces. With the exception of the delegation from Utrecht (totaling

---

[94]John Hales to D. Carleton, Dort, November 19/29, 1618, John Hales, "Mr. Hales Letters From the Synod of Dort to the Right Honourable Sir. Dudley Carleton," in John Hales, Golden Remains (2nd ed.; London, 1711), p. 382.

[95]Ibid., p. 383.

three), all of these representatives were contra-Remonstrants. The Utrecht delegation was generally treated like the official Remonstrant group - as "the accused." They were seated with the Remonstrants, and were passed over when the oath was administered in some form or another to all the other representatives.[96] The elected president of the Synod was John Bogerman, "the straitest member of the Calvinistic party, who had previously avowed his own opinion that all persons who declined to acquiese in the established dogmas should be punished by the civil sword."[97]

The representatives of the Remonstrants numbered thirteen. They came to the Synod demanding to be treated as equals, challenging the validity of the Synod, and claiming the right to present their case as they saw fit. At his first coming Episcopius, the chief Arminian spokes-

---

[96] The oath was: "I promise before God, whom I believe and adore, the present searcher of the heart and reins, that in all this synodal action, wherein shall be appointed the examination, judgment, and decision, as well of the known five articles, and difficulties thence arising, as of all other doctrinals; that I will not make use of any human writing, but only of God's word, for the certain and undoubted rule of faith; and that I shall propound nothing to myself in this whole cause besides the glory of God, the peace of the church, and especially the preservation of the purity of doctrine therein. So may my Saviour Jesus Christ be merciful unto me whom I earnestly pray, that in this my purpose He would always be present with me with the grace of His Spirit." Fuller, The Church History..., V, 464. Fuller cites the oath as given to him by Joseph Hall who, years after the Synod, attempted to refute a charge that the Synodians had taken an oath to condemn the Remonstrants.

[97] Hardwick, p. 195.

man, sparked the initial flames by referring to the Synod as a conference. He was immediately informed that they "came not to Conference, neither did the Synod profess themselves an adverse Party against them...They ought to have heeded the words of the Letters by which they were cited. They were called not to Conference, but to propose their Opinions with their Reasons, and leave it to the Synod to judge of them. The Synod would be a Judge and not a Party."[98]

Such was the environment in which the Synod operated. A special table in the center of the room was prepared for the Remonstrants;[99] they were instructed to give no information of what occurred at the sessions to other Remonstrants (although the Synod was open to the public), and perhaps most revealing of all, when sessions were in progress which the Remonstrants were not attending, they were shut up in a locked room![100]

The Remonstrants objected most strongly to the procedure of discussion dictated by the Synod. They specifically opposed the contra-Remonstrant refusal to permit discussion of reprobation, and the inquisitional method of inquiry, i.e., the Arminians were to answer directly the questions

---

[98] Hales to Carleton, Dort, November 6, 1618, Hales, p. 404.

[99] Ibid., p. 403.

[100] Harrison, Beginnings..., p. 314.

put to them without expanding or presenting their case as they saw fit.

To the first objection the Synod president argued that since reprobation was not one of the five articles (the Five Articles of the Grand Remonstrance which formed the basis for the program of discussion), it could not be discussed until after the other five were completed.[101] The Arminian chance of proving their case, however, depended in their opinion upon stating their objections to the Calvinist theology of reprobation at the outset. The reply to Episcopius's use of the term "conference" essentially constituted Bogerman's response to the second objection.

On both points Hales expressed some sympathy with the Arminians. On the occasion of subsequent discussion of reprobation he wrote Carleton: "I would have wished that the question of Reprobation had been yet further opened and stood upon, it being a point of large extent, and especially insisted on by the Remonstrants.[102] As for the interrogational aspect of the proceedings Hales noted that Bogerman "is desirous that the Course he hath thought of may take place, the English and others, that some more ready and

---

[101] Hales to Carleton, Dort, December $\frac{17}{27}$ 1618, Hales, p. 434.

[102] Hales to Carleton, Dort, January $\frac{5}{15}$, 1618 (1619 NS), ibid., p. 458.

compendious way may be taken."[103]

The Remonstrants held fast to their objections in spite of the order of the States General that they promise obedience to all synodical decrees under pain of civil as well as ecclesiastical sanctions. On January 11 they appeared before the Synod with a compromise - they would be willing to answer as many questions as would be put to them if they would then be permitted to expound their views and refute contrary opinions. Bogerman refused to accept the compromise, and dismissed the Remonstrants from the Synod.[104]

Aware of the bias of the provincial delegates, the English were inclined to be much more moderate in their approach to the Arminians. In one letter to Carleton, Hales expressed concern that their moderation was not well received.[105] He quickly found that his concern was

---

[103]Hales to Carleton, Dort, January $\frac{1}{11}$, 1619, ibid., p. 453.

[104]Hales to Carleton, Dort, January $\frac{5}{15}$, 1618 (1619 NS), ibid., pp. 456-60.

[105]Hales to Carleton, Dort, February 13, 1618 (1619 NS), ibid., p. 455. There is a peculiar problem with this letter which is dated February 13, 1618 (OS). In the 1673 edition of Hales's Golden Remains it is attributed to Balcanqual. The 1711 edition attributes it to Hales with the same date. Harrison (Beginnings..., p. 329) and Brandt (III, 152-53) follow the 1673 edition. On the basis of the date of the letter they would appear to be correct for Hales returned to The Hague in February and Balcanqual replaced him as correspondent to D. Carleton. (From February on the meetings were no longer public, and Hales could not attend them.) But why would Balcanqual write in February of events

unnecessary. The dissenting opinions of the English and other foreign delegations were not so much poorly received as ignored. Immediately before the appearance of the Remonstrants at the January 11 session it was proposed that the delegates pass their judgment on the behavior of the Remonstrants. But only the foreign delegates, not the provincials, were required to speak on the proposal and "by these means the envy of the whole business was derived upon the Foreigners."[106] Moreover, when the question was then formally posed, and the foreign delegates spoke favourably in the Remonstrants's behalf, the provincials "struck in, and established a rigid Sentence against the Foreigners liking. So that there is little regard given to the Judgment of the Foreigners, except they speak as the Provincials would have them."[107]

To add insult to injury, when the Remonstrants later praised the moderation of the foreigners at the January 11

---

that had taken place in January when Hales was the correspondent? Moreover, in all his other letters Hales had kept D. Carleton informed immediately of what had passed in the Synod. Why did he not report the important event of the dismissal action? It is possible that the letter was dated incorrectly (in both editions) - and in fact Hales was the author. On this assumption, and because I have used the 1711 edition, I attribute the letter to Hales. But, for the sake of caution, I will refer to this note whenever citing this particular letter.

[106] Hales to Carleton, Dort, January $\frac{6}{16}$, 1618 (1619 NS), ibid., p. 461.

[107] Ibid.

meeting, Bogerman answered, "the Moderation of the Foreignors which you so much extolled, proceeded out of their Errour which today having understood, they have pronounced concerning you another Sentence."[108]

It is difficult to judge what upset Dudley Carleton's correspondent the most - the attempt to use and abuse the foreign delegations or the irregular dismissal of the Remonstrants. He reported that the January 11 meeting (where the Remonstrant offer of a compromise was rejected) was actually a farce. The delegates had their decree of dismissal written even before the Remonstrants entered the synod hall. They had asked for the views of the foreigners "hoping it should have been answerable to their Decree," finding it otherwise, they published their decree "without so much as laying their heads together for consultation."[109]

As for the actions of Bogerman who not only dismissed the Remonstrants, but did so with extremely bitter words (at the final meeting with them on January 14), Hales wrote

> ...they were called in and dismissed, with such a powdering Speech as I doubt not but your Lordship hath heard with grief enough, I protest I am much afflicted when I think of it. For if the Remonstrants should write that the President pronounced a sentence, which was not the

---

[108] Hales to Carleton, Dort, January $\frac{5}{15}$, 1618 (1619 NS), ibid., pp. 458-59.

[109] Hales to Carleton, Dort, February 13, 1618 (1619 NS), ibid., p. 455. See note 105.

> sentence of the Synod, they should not lie. The Civil Lawyers and Cannon of France, who writ much about the formalities omitted in the Council of Trent, urge Exceptions of less moment than these; so neither was there above a third part of the voices asked,...neither was the sentence conceived in writt, and approved by the Synod, and the bitter words in the Sentence were not the words of any of the suffrages, unless that some of them of them were spoken by one man only.[110]

Even Dudley Carleton, whose bias in favor of the contra-Remonstrants has been pointed out, described Bogerman's manner of dismissal as "in very rough and uncivil Terms,... but it is not now in integro to look back...They must therefore go forward,...do the best they may, leaving the Events to God."[111]

Going forward without the Remonstrants required a whole new set of procedures. It was decided that the five Articles of the Remonstrants would be judged on the basis of an examination of various writings of the Arminians. Each of the Articles was to be discussed in turn with theological professors discoursing on various points proposed and introduced by the president. In the meanwhile

---

[110] Ibid. See also letter of January 6/16, 1618 (1619 NS), ibid., pp. 461-62 for further condemnation of the dismissal action.

[111] Dudley Carleton to Archbishop Abbot, The Hague, January 19, 1618 (1619 NS) in Hales, Golden Remains, p. 574. See also Hales to Carleton, Dort, February 13, 1618 (1619 NS), "Mr. Hales Letters...," pp. 455-56. (Note 105).

each delegation or college would prepare its own judgment of the Articles, which at the end of the general discussions, would be presented each article in turn by the various delegations. After the presentations the final canons would be drawn up and presented to the Synod.

The method was anything but orderly, and whereas previously the business had been slowed by continual disruptions, now the Synod attempted to hurry the discussions of the Articles.

> For our Synod-business, as we went too slow before, so now they would have us go too fast; they would have us to dispatch one Article a week, which is too little time for so weighty Questions.[112]

In the discussions and presentations of judgments on the various articles, the English delegation attempted on the one hand to reconcile differences between various delegates and delegations, and on the other, to urge moderation of the open bias against, and prejudgment of the Remonstrants. Although they were successful to some extent in the former, they had little success with the latter.

By February 2, 1619 Balcanqual had replaced Hales as correspondent to D. Carleton. His letters are full not only of descriptions of the frustration and insult reaped by

---

[112] Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, February 2, 1619, Walter Balcanqual, "Dr. Balcanquals Letters From the Synod of Dort to the Right Honorable, Sir Dudley Carlton," in John Hales, Golden Remains, p. 469.

the English effort at moderation, but also of condemnations of procedures that mocked any description of the Synod as fair.

When the Synod consulted about the drawing up of books clarifying the synodical judgments even before those judgments had been reached, Balcanqual complained

> It will make the world to think they came resolved what to do, which though perchance they did, yet it is no wisdom to confess it.[113]

The Synod was so anxious "to kill the Remonstrants" that in one particular article (II), "they would make their words have that sense which no Grammar can find in them,"[114] and while condemning their words in the proposed canon "as most curious,...would have it retained only to make the Remonstrants odious."[115]

The Synod response to the English continued to be a curious combination of ignoring their advice, while making it appear that the Synod had the full support of its foreign delegations. The English were well aware of both aspects of the curious combination. When it came time for them to present their judgment on the first article, they requested that the judgment be read publicly (as opposed to the

---

[113] Hales to Carleton, Dort, February 7, 1619, Hales, pp. 465-66.

[114] Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, April $\frac{9}{19}$, 1619, Balcanqual, p. 524.

[115] Ibid., p. 525.

private readings which had been the procedure after the dismissal of the Remonstrants). Although it was argued that a public reading might "convert" the Remonstrants, and would publicize the consensus of the Synod, the real reason for the English motion was their desire to make the independent opinion of the English delegation a matter of public record. The English had taken pains with Arminian writings "to condemn no more but that which must be condemned, and to condemn too some hard phrases of the contra-Remonstrants especially in the matter of Reprobation." They knew that in final canons which would be made public "no word of ours, which found anything that way shall be expressed..."[116] The president opposed the English motion, attempting to discredit it with the plea that since it was a matter of order, he hoped the Synod would trust his judgment. When this subtle pressure was unsuccessful, he used a less subtle lobbying technique, and the motion was subsequently voted down.[117]

The English protest against the procedure for drawing up the canons met with more success. When it came time to draw up the official canons Bogerman's plan was to "take upon him more than ever any President did, to make Canons

---

[116] Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, March 9, 1619, ibid., pp. 495-96.

[117] Ibid., pp. 495-97.

and pass them by placet or non placet..."[118] The offensiveness of this arbitrary procedure was intensified for the English by their Anglican horror that "the President should dictate Canons and the rest especially a Bishop write after him; so that he maketh the Canons, and the whole Synod are called non ad consilium, sed tantum consensum."[119] At the insistence of the English, it was finally decided that three foreign and three domestic divines would assist the president in drawing up the canons.

But the English concern with the final product of the Synod was not limited to procedure. Completely contrary to the Anglican tradition the Synod would have their canons "so full charged with Catechetical Speculations, as they will be ready to burst..." Balcanqual feared not only that they would "make the Synod a thing to be laughed at in after Ages," but that the English would be called to account for that which they did not really approve.

> The President and his Provincials have no care of the Credit of Strangers, nor of that Account which we must yield at our return unto all Men that shall be pleased to call for it...[120]

In spite of the advisory committee the final draft of the

---

[118] Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, March 25, 1619, ibid., p. 520.

[119] Ibid., p. 519.

[120] Ibid., p. 520.

canons was still too detailed and prescriptive for English taste. Commenting upon the censure of the Remonstrants (which the English did not participate in, in spite of the urgings of the synod), Balcanqual wrote

> ...methinketh it is hard, that every Man should be deposed from his Ministry, who will not hold every particular Canon; never did any Church of old, nor any Reformed Church propose so many Articles to be held sub poena excommunicationis;...121

Nor in strict theological terms were the English completely satisfied with the findings of the synod. A relatively minor dissatisfaction grew out of the synod's refusal to affirm the sublapsarian doctrine of predestination. The fracas over this point came early in the meetings when the Belgick delegation presented their judgment. Gomarus, Arminius's old opponent, now a member of the Belgick delegation, objected to the presentation because it took for granted the sublapsarian theology when the point "had not as yet been determined in the Belgick Churches, in the French, not English Churches, and many others."[122] Carleton immediately replied that since he and his colleagues had already spoken for the sublapsarian position, Gomarus's statement implied that they had not

---

[121] Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, April 25, 1619, ibid., p. 526.

[122] Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, March 26, 1619, ibid., p. 501.

presented a position in accordance with the teaching of the Church of England. To prove the contrary Goad read aloud the seventeenth of the Thirty-nine Articles stressing the words "quosdam ex humano genere, in exitio & maledicto" ("those of mankind from curse and damnation," implying fallen man, not natural man was the object of election). Bogerman warned Gomarus to be careful with the teachings of other churches, and the matter would have been dropped had not Carleton pushed for a synodical affirmation of the sublapsarian position. Pointing out that all the foreign divines, all the Belgic professors, except Gomarus, had already spoken in favor of that position, and most probably the provincials would do the same, Carleton urged Bogerman not to abstain from the issue simply because of the particular Opinion of one Professor. Thereupon Gomarus pointed specifically to "Dr. Whitaker and Mr. Perkins," who "had determined the contary, whom he took to be such men as would not disasent from the Confession of the Church of England."[123] Discomforted, the English made no reply, and Bogerman buried the subject permanently with the vague and unkept promise that it would be discussed after the canons were drawn up.

The differences among English churchmen on predestination theology hampered the English delegation again in their

---

[123] Ibid., pp. 505-06.

judgment of the second article. This time the differences appeared within their own delegation. The articles in question dealt with the scope of Christ's atonement. Ward and Davenant maintained with the Remonstrants that Christ died for all men; Carleton, Goad and Balcanqual with the contra-Remonstrants maintained that Christ died only for the elect. With its general language, the thirty-first of the English Articles of Religion was susceptible to either interpretation. Ward and Davenant interpreted the words "sins of the whole world" in that Article to refer to every individual man; the three other delegates interpreted them to mean the sins of all sorts of men.[124]

Following their instructions in regard to unity, the delegates wrote to Archbishop Abbot for an official interpretation. But regarding their differences "as no matter of Salvation..."[125] (a view that the Dutch Calvinists certainly did not share), they were able to reach a compromise based on a distinction between a general or

---

[124]The thirty-first article stated "...the offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual..." The differences between the members of the delegation were no secret at home. On March 30, 1619 Hall wrote from Waltham to Ward at Dort: "...we heard news of differences betwixt you; belike the end is peace. I shall long for your return. that I may be sated with a full relation..." Godfrey Goodman, The Court of James the First, ed. John S. Brewer (London, 1839), II, 194.

[125]Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, February 9, 1619, Balcanqual, p. 471.

sufficient and a special or efficacious grace wrought through the atonement of Christ. Christ's atonement was universal in that sufficient grace for salvation was made available to all men who would believe, but in order to take advantage of that atonement, a special or efficacious grace was necessary, and that special efficacious grace was granted only to the elect.[126]

Having reached this compromise they wrote again to Abbot (before receiving a reply to their first letter) informing him that they had resolved their differences with a position "which...can incurr no exception in our Church..." and requesting him to leave them to their own defences in the matter.[127] Unfortunately unity through compromise was not so easily come by at home as it was among the five Englishmen at Dort. In his reply Abbot instructed them to "conform to the received distinction and restriction" (i.e., atonement for the elect only).[128] By this time the English

---

[126]In his Articles of Controversy in the Low Countries Overall claimed that his interpretation of the atonement of Christ was that of the Church of England. See John Overall, Articles of Controversy..., in William Goode, The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants (London, 1850), pp. 127-33. In 1627 Davenant wrote a tract entitled Dissertation on the Death of Christ, in which he reasserted the position of the English delegation at Dort. See Morris Fuller, The Life... for the details of Davenant's theology.

[127]The British Divines to Archbishop Abbot, Dort, February 28, 1618 (1619 NS), Hales, Golden Remains, p. 582.

[128]Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, March 17, 1619, Balcanqual, pp. 512-13.

had already read their judgment which had leaned not toward Abbot's latest directions but toward the broader interpretation of the article.[129]

There was indeed some confusion as to the position which the delegates were expected to support. In his comment on Abbot's letter, Balcanqual noted that the directions which Dudley Carleton had sent "do seem to will us to be as favourable to the general propositions as may be, giving as little offence to the Lutherans as we can;..."[130] The delegates took the only possible recourse' they again wrote to Abbot explaining their reasons for "enlarging Grace beyond Election"

---

[129]In fact they had avoided making a direct statement on the distinction between sufficient and efficacious grace as well as on the more general question of the scope of the sacrifice. "Christ died for all inasmuch as by means of faith all who fulfill the conditions can by virtue of this ransom obtain and have remission of their sins and eternal life. He died for the elect inasmuch as they infallibly obtain faith and eternal life by the merit of the death which is specially devised for them according to the eternal good will of God."

[130]Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, March 17, 1619, Balcanqual, p. 513. According to Heylyn (Historia Quinquarticularis..., III, 106) James had instructed the delegates not to oppose the theology of universal redemption. Harrison (Beginnings..., p. 337) sees this letter of Balcanqual as confirmation of Heylyn's point. It is difficult to say. Certainly there is no reference here to direct instructions from James. And Balcanqual does note that Abbot claimed to have "acquainted his Majesty and received approbation from him" (p. 513) on the instructions Abbot sent. Either Abbot did not acquaint James with the problem, or James, in his confusion over the issue, permitted contradictory instructions to be given to the delegates.

> Our tenderness herein hitherto used is the more awaked by late intimation given us by my Lord Embassador of His Majesties strict Charte; "That before the Synodical resolution concerning Christ's Death, and the application of it to us, we stand upon it, to have those Conclusions couched, in manner, and terms, as near as possibly may be, to those which were used in the Primitive Church by the Fathers of that time against the Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians, and not in any new Phrase of the Modern Age: and that the same may be as agreeable to the Confessions of the Church of England, and other Reformed Churches, and with as little distaste and umbrage to the Lutheran Churches as may be.[131]

Whatever the reaction of Abbot, the delegation protected themselves by pointing out that their instructions from D. Carleton were recent, and moreover were "His Majesties strict Charge." James's instructions, if so they were, required a compromise - how else could they at one and the same time present a position agreeable to other Reformed Churches that did not offend the Lutheran churches?

The English were as successful in the Synod as they had been in their maneuverings with Abbot. With the words, "And, whereas many who are called by the gospel do not repent nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief,"[132]

---

[131] British Divines to Archbishop Abbot, Dort, March 11, 1618 (1619 NS), Hales, Golden Remains, pp. 583-84.

[132] The English did not get this satisfaction without a struggle, particularly in regard to the removal of the phrase, "Unbelievers will be damned, not only on account of their unbelief, but also for all their other sins, as well

the canons on the second article reflected the view that atonement in Christ was sufficient to cover all the sins of all men, but in fact did not.

The English had no quarrel with the judgment of the other four articles. At most they objected to some of the harsh language in them.[133] The English objections to some parts of the Epilogue are minor in terms of theological content, but are important indicators of the English effort to accommodate the Synod without compromising themselves or their church. They wanted to append a paragraph condemning some of the more extreme Calvinistic utterances in the writings of the contra-Remonstrants, e.g., "that no man is able to do more good than he does," "that God moved the tongues of men to blaspheme Him." But they were overruled on the excuse that these were quotations from foreign divines, and not within the jurisdiction of the Synod.[134]

---

original as actual," a statement that would negate any regenerative effect of baptism. The English were not completely happy with the canons on this article because some of the negative canons, i.e., those on errors to be rejected, involved judgments that should have been left to the schools, and not decided by a synod. Balcanqual to Carleton, Dort, April 4/14, 1619, Balcanqual, p. 523. See also pp. 530-31. Beginning with the session of March 26 (Session 127) Balcanqual did not have time to write to Carleton, so he kept a diary on the sessions held between March 26 and May 9. This diary is included in Hales, Golden Romains as part of the Balcanqual correspondence to Carleton, pp. 527-53.

[133]See Scott, pp. 78-138 for the articles drawn up by the Synod.

[134]Hales, Golden Remains, pp. 534-35 (Balcanqual's diary).

They objected to the expression that the canons had been drawn up according to the sentiments of "all the Reformed Churches" because it implied that the Lutheran churches were not reformed.[135] The sentence was changed to "our Reformed Churches," but the word "our" was left out in the printed copies of the canons.[136]

The most important aspect of the English objections was their statement in regard to their limited authority to speak for the Church of England. This statement was made in the form of an objection to the words "that the doctrines comprised in these Canons ought to be esteemed the doctrine of the Reformed Churches." The English delegation declared

> They were deputed to this Synod by their King, and not their Church. That they were by no means impowered to explain the Confession of their Church; but had only delivered their own private opinions, as thinking them agreeable to Truth. And that they had agreed to many things in these Canons of which there was not the least notice taken in the Articles of the Church of England; which they had done, because they were not sensible that any of the matters therein contained were repugnant to the said Articles.[137]

---

[135] Ibid., p. 538.

[136] According to Brandt (III, 282) Bogerman was suspect of having dropped the "our" on his own authority.

[137] Hales, Golden Remains, pp. 534-35 (Balcanqual's diary). "...se enim profitebantur deputatos a serenissima

In describing themselves as delegates of the King, not the Church, the delegation not only absolved the English Church of any responsibility for what was propagated in the canons, but at the same time cast an Erastian stone in the eye of the Synod. It had been a major issue among the Dutch as to who should arbitrate in religious controversy, and the contra-Remonstrants had argued for church as opposed to state arbitration - a position which Dudley Carleton, with a peculiar logic had claimed was similar to the English procedure.[138] Now the Dutch were told that the English state, as personified by the monarch, not the English Church, had participated in the Synod. The English delegation was to remain Erastian in fact as well as theory.

Despite the claim that nothing had been canonized which the delegates thought repugnant to the teachings of their church, it was known that the English thought the canons were too prescriptive. The English Church was unlikely to take upon itself the tight theological limits with which the Dutch had bound themselves. Moreover, the English delegates as well as their master knew that the

---

Regia majestate non ab Ecclesis suis, nullam sibi comissam authoritatem qua possent Ecclesiarum suarum confessiones explicare, tuilisse se tantum privata sua judcia quae ipsi putarent vera esse; multa se in canonibus tanquam ver conclusisse, de quibus ne verbum quidem habetur in Ecclesiarum suarum Confessionibus, verum quod sciant nihil in illis contineri quod istis confessionibus repugnaret..."

[138] See pp. 183-84.

Synod was political in character. Its primary goal, all protestations to the contrary, was not to judge the Arminian theology, so much as to judge the Arminians; and the tight canons were just handmaidens to this task.

The farewell speeches of the English, though full of praise for the Synod, made clear that the English knew the vindictive political use to which the canons would be put. Goad recommended moderation, exhorting them to try to "bring back the strayed sheep with gentleness, and not to use them rigorously..."[139] Davenant and Ward warned that "it is not seemly in grave and moderate divines to obtrude upon all others their own way of thinking,"[140] particularly when diversity of opinion did not disturb the peace of the church. With overtones of Bishop Overall at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, they urged caution lest wrangling over the mysteries of predestination lead to negligence of the life-giving gospel; that the mystery of reprobation be handled sparingly and prudently; that "the horrible and unscriptural opinions be avoided;" and that in teaching of Christ's death they "never weaken the promises of the Gospel universally propounded."[141]

The English divines did not speak of the canons them-

---

[139] Quoted in Brandt, III, 306.

[140] Quoted in Hardwick, pp. 196-97.

[141] Ibid.

selves, but of the use of them. They knew only too well that there had not been a true and fair judgment of the Arminian case, that the Synod had been a fabrication for enforcing a judgment already made. And now the English delegates warned against the all too great likelihood of political and repressive use being made of the canons to which they had subscribed their names.

Although the Church of England was "protected," the "secularization" of the authority of the English delegation did not remove all the contradictions and problems posed by English participation in the Synod. At the Hampton Court Conference in 1604, James had ruled against making a dogma of the perseverance of the saints, but as a dogma it appeared in the Canons of Dort. James was the arch-enemy of presbyterian church form, and the Synod had inserted into the Dutch Confession the words "Christ established an Equality among the ministers of the Gospel" (an insertion that Carleton had opposed).[142] On the questions of the sign of the cross in baptism, the status of the apocryphal books, and Christ's descent into Hell, the Synod set forth positions directly contrary to those of James. Moreover the Synod had shown great reverence for David Pareus, a German Calvinist whose works on resistance to tyranny, James ordered burned in 1622 as "false, seditious, impious, and tending to

---

[142]Hales, Golden Remains, pp. 544-45 (Balcanqual's diary); and Fuller, The Church History..., V. 471-72.

destroy the Civil Government."[143]

But James was greatly pleased by the work of the Synod, and of his own delegation. All but one were rewarded with some honor or preferment. Carleton was made bishop of Chichester; Davenant was promoted to the see of Salisbury; Samuel Ward was appointed Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge; and Walter Balcanqual was made Dean of Rochester.[144] Thomas Goad was the single exception. According to one historian, Goad was being punished for not having followed instructions - he had wanted to have the manners and method of the contra-Remonstrants at the Synod condemned.[145] In the letters of Hales and Balcanqual there is no mention of this; but it is known that after the Synod, Goad temporarily went over to the Arminians.[146] He was not alone; according

---

[143]The Dutch were horrified at James's action. Some said that the Defender of the Faith had become its enemy. One John Kloppenburg, a minister in Amsterdam, said that if the King was not a Papist, he suspected him to be an Atheist. De la Roche, p. 718. See Chapter V of this study.

[144]Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, III, 48. Hall was offered the bishopric of Gloucester in 1624, but refused it. In an editorial note to Fuller, The Church History..., V, 475, J.S. Brewer stated that Balcanqual received the Mastership of Savoy as his reward. Actually Balcanqual was Master of Savoy in 1617, a year before the Synod was convened. See Calender of State Papers Domestic, 1611-18, p. 504.

[145]Itterzoon, p. 199.

[146]Dictionary of National Biography, XXII, 20. In a tract entitled A Disputation Partly Theological Partly Metaphysical, Concerning the Necessity and Contingency of Events, in Respect of God's Eternal Decrees (n.d.) in A Collection of Tracts Concerning Predestination and Providence And Other

to Antony Farindon who wrote the preface to Golden Remains, his observations at the Synod also moved John Hales "to bid Calvin good-night."[147]

During James's reign the contradictions inherent in the English participation in the Synod of Dort were never faced. James had permitted, in fact delegated, Englishmen to discuss in the Netherlands the very same topics on which he forbade public discussion in England. Moreover, as much as the English delegation had encouraged moderation, they had signed their names to a document which not only condemned theological doctrines held by some of the churchmen closest to the king, but also, in so doing, had lent a hand to the persecution of a Dutch scholar held in the highest esteem by some of these same churchmen. During James's reign these contradictions were encompassed in a policy dictated by James's personal philosophy and theology. But in the late 1620's they became a major part of yet another controversy over predestination theology that James bequeathed to his son.

Points Depending Upon Them (Cambridge, 1719), pp. 357ff, Goad attacked the Calvinist notion in respect to sin that God did not compel the will, but disposed it to desire certain things. "This Flim-flam would move any Man's patience." (p. 372). He argues that sins are committed contingently in respect to God, necessarily in respect to man, and that "Good Duties, properly so called,...are never performed without Choice and Freedom" (pp. 384-85).

[147]The claim that Hales became an Arminian is not well documented. According to A.W. Harrison ("The Church of England's Reaction from Calvinism in the Seventeenth Century," Religion in Life, XIII /Spring, 1944/, p. 213) it can be traced only to Antony Farindon.

C H A P T E R V

JAMES AND ENGLISH ARMINIANISM

It has been charged that James was a Calvinist abroad, and an Arminian at home.[1] Despite the contradictions between the theological policy James advanced abroad and the one he supported at home, there is no evidence that the actual theology James professed at home was any different from the theology he promoted abroad. In both cases James was, "like the ministers among whom he had been educated,"[2] a Calvinist.

The confusion over James's theology is a result of the fact that James's particular commitment to Calvinism did not require that every churchman in his kingdom share the monarch's personal views on predestination theology. In fact, as will be further noted, churchmen with Arminian sympathies gained high position not only within the Church, but also within the ecclesiastical circle at court.

James's Arminian policy in England was actually the

---

[1]Motley, I, 45-46; G.S. Wakefield, "Arminianism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," London Quarterly and Holborn Review (October, 1960), pp. 254-55; and Henry Hallam, The Constitutional History of England From the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II (London, 1855), I, 403.

[2]John Hunt, Religious Thought in England From the Reformation To the End of the Last Century (London, 1870-73), I, 120.

same as his policy in regard to English lay Catholics. He would not trouble men's consciences if they kept their opinions and theologies private, and were "quiet and well-minded men, peaceable Subjects."

> ...I must put a difference betwixt mine own private profession of mine own salvation, and my politic government of the realm for weal and quietness thereof...as I would be loather to dispense in the least point of mine own conscience for any wordly respect than the foolishest precisian of them all, so would I be as sorry to strait the politic government of the bodies and minds of all my subjects to my private opinions...
>
> ...I would be sorry to punish their bodies for the errour of their minds, the reformation whereof must onely come of God and the trew Spirit.[3]

As long as churchmen and scholars having Arminian sympathies did not publicly affirm their theological differences with James's Calvinism and stimulate controversy within his realm, they were not disturbed. As a result, academic Arminians continued to make their appearance at the Universities, and from there, if they were diplomatic about their personal theologies, graduated to some of the highest ecclesiastical offices of the Church.

---

[3] "A Speach As It Was Delivered in the Upper House of the Parliament March 19, 1603," (1604 NS) in James, The Works of the Most High and Mighty Prince James, King etc. Compiled by James, Bishop of Winton and Deane of His Majesties Chappel Royall. (London, 1616), pp. 484 ff. He expressed a similar view in "A Speach in the Star Chamber June 20, 1616," ibid., pp. 549-69.

The tradition of academic anti-Calvinism was carried on at Cambridge by John Richardson, Richard ("Dutch") Thomson, and Samuel Harsnett.

Educated at Clare College, a fellow of Emmanuel College, Richardson succeeded John Overall as Regius Professor of Divinity in 1607, and Robert Some as Master of Peterhouse in 1609. In 1615 he became Master of Trinity College, in the Memoriale of which he is praised as uniting "the cardinal excellencies of each one and all" of his illustrious predecessors.[4]

Little is known of his associates, and even less of his work and theology.[5] Heylyn merely notes that Richardson "being a corpulent man, was publickly reproach'd in St. Maries Pulpit in his own University, by the name of a Fat bellied Arminian."[6] He was an intimate of Lancelot Andrewes, and through him became acquainted with Hugo Grotius and Isaac Casaubon.[7]

---

[4]Quoted in J.B. Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, II, 493-94. The Journals of the House of Commons present a different picture of Richardson. On at least two occasions complaints were filed against him for popishness. See Journals of the House of Commons, I, 777, 791.

[5]Sparse notes of his lectures on predestination have been preserved at the Cambridge University Library, MS. Gg 1/29.

[6]Peter Heylyn, Cyprianus Anglicus: Or, the History of /Laud/ (London, 1671), p. 122.

[7]Abbot to Winwood, Lambeth, June 1, 1613, Winwood, III, 459. See also Mark Pattison, Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614 (London, 1875), p. 359.

Although his name occurs more frequently in the literature and chronicles of the period, Richard Thomson is also an unknown. He was born of English parents in Holland (hence his nickname "Dutch"), but was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, and received his M.A. from Oxford. In the early years of James's reign he held some office at Clare College, the specific title and nature of which is not known. Unlike Baro and Barret who had preceded him, Thomson was not directly and well acquainted with the Dutch problem.[8] In a letter dated July 27, 1605 he wrote of Arminius:

> ...the name of that person is not so obscure with us...for I knew him formerly very well, before he taught publickly in your University; since then he has been known here by many others. Wherefore our Divines enquire deligently after Arminius, as often as any Students come over to us. I rejoice therefore, and congratulate your University, that has so great a Man in her service.[9]

Thomson was also a close associate of Isaac Casaubon and of John Overall.[10] He had met Casaubon in Geneva and they subsequently maintained a close correspondence until

---

[8] He had been traveling in Italy and on the Continent in 1595-96 when the controversy over Baro and Barret occurred.

[9] Quoted in Brandt, II, note, p. 99.

[10] In his Appello Evangelium For the True Doctrine of the Divine Predestination, Concorded with the Orthodox Doctrine of Gods Free Grace and Mans Free Will (London, 1651), p. 22, John Playfere described Thomson as Overall's "diligent auditor and familiar."

Casaubon came to England in 1610.[11] At that time Thomson was having trouble maintaining his position at Cambridge and appealed to Casaubon for aid. Thomson had written a work touching on the defectibility of grace entitled De intercisione Gratiae, & Justificationis. The book had been answered by Robert Abbot, Vice Chancellor of Oxford, and had earned Thomson the enmity of Robert's brother, the Archbishop.[12] Moreover, Thomson had a drinking problem that seriously interfered with his teaching. Although his Arminianism certainly prejuciced Abbot against him, there is no doubt that his personal habits played some part in his troubles at Cambridge, for those who petitioned for his removal were the fellows of his own Clare Hall.

In spite of his drinking Thomson was a very fine scholar. His knowledge of Hebrew was such that he was appointed one of the translators of the Bible in 1604. He helped Casaubon with his Greek scholarship, and acted as "Our Man in England" to numerous continental scholars.[13] Nevertheless his reputation as an Arminian and as a toper surpassed his repute as a scholar. Although Richard Montague praised him as "a most admirable philologer...

---

[11] See J. Glucker, "Richard Thomson to Isaac Casaubon, 1596," Bibliotheque d'Humanisme et Renaissance, no 1. (1968), pp. 149-52; and Pattison, pp. 31, 36, 62, 295-97.

[12] Pattison, pp. 350-52; Heylyn, Cyprianus..., p. 122.

[13] Glucker, p. 152.

better known in Italy, France, and Germany than at home,"[14] to the Calvinist Thomas Hickman, he was "the grand propagator of Arminianism,"[15] to an unknown writer, Thomson was one of "a new brood of such as did assist Arminianism...,"[16] and to William Prynne he was "a debosh'd drunken English Dutchman who seldom went one night to bed sober."[17]

Samuel Harsnett belonged to the older generation of academic Arminians. After his Paul's Cross sermon in 1584, he was not noted in the literature of the period as an outspoken anti-Calvinist.[18] He spoke out in support of Baro in 1596,[19] and in 1616 the fellows of Pembroke College, of

---

[14]Preface to Diatribe in the first part of Montague's History of Tithes (1621). This was interesting praise from one who earlier had plagiarized from Casaubon's incomplete and unpublished works. See Pattison, pp. 373 ff.

[15]Henry Hickman, Historia Quinq-Articularis Exarticulata (1674), p. 91.

[16]Quoted in James Bass Mullinger, Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century (London, 1867), p. 69. The full citation is: "'Lately,' says a writer, speaking of Chappell who was a fellow of Christ's during Milton's residence there, 'there spruing up a new brood of such as did assist Arminianism, as Dutch Thomson of Clare Hall, and Mr. William Chappel, fellow of Christ's College, as the many pupils that were arminianized under his tuition show.'" The McAlpin Catalogue lists Chappell (1583-1649) as Bishop of Cork and author of Preacher, Or the Art and Method of Preaching (1656). I have not been able to find any other information about him.

[17]William Prynne, Anti-Arminianisme, Appendix.

[18]See Chapter II of this study. Hickman (p. 495) notes that Harsnett "lived and died an Arminian."

[19]Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 303 ff.

which Harsnett had been appointed Master in 1605, accused him of favoring popery, a charge that could well mean that he had exhibited Arminian and anti-Calvinist sympathies. As a result of this charge and others,[20] he was forced to resign from the mastership of Pembroke. But like other major Elizabethan anti-Calvinists,[21] he was able to advance himself within the church hierarchy by being discreet about his theological predilections. In 1609 he was appointed to the see of Chichester, and in 1619 to Norwich. In that latter position he was again charged with lack of orthodoxy - this time before the Houses of Commons and Lords.[22] Since he became Archbishop of York in 1628, the charges obviously came to naught.

The pivot of the pro-Arminian charge against James lay not so much in the academic positions and freedom permitted within the Universities as in the ecclesiastical preference and courtly favor shown to churchmen with Arminian sympathies. Lancelot Andrewes, John Overall, and Isaac Casaubon were such members of the ecclesiastical entourage that frequented James's court. They not only preached for James, but entertained him with theological table talk and wrote his anti-papal treatises. Of these courtly divines

---

[20] He was also charged with absence from the College and improper handling of accounts.

[21] e.g., Lancelot Andrewes and John Overall.

[22] Journals of the House of Lords, III, 388-89.

Andrewes was probably James's favorite.[23]

During James's reign Andrewes advanced from Chichester (1605-09) to the sees of Ely (1609-19) and Winchester (1619-26). He was Dean of the Chapels Royal, Privy Councellor (1616-26), and served as a member of the Court of High Commission, the Star Chamber, and the Convocation of Canterbury. At the same time Andrewes played some part in the institutional and ecclesiastical advancement of the academic Arminians at Cambridge. He appointed Richardson to the mastership of Peterhouse in 1608, presented Thomson to the rectory of Snailwell, Cambridgeshire,[24] and adopted a later Cambridge Arminian, Matthew Wren, as his protege and chaplain.[25]

Andrewes's general reluctance to discuss or debate predestination has been mentioned in noting his response to the Lambeth Articles. It is this reluctance that makes it difficult to classify him formally as "Arminian," but a reading of some of his sermons makes it clear that his personal theology certainly lay in that direction.

Andrewes's refusal to speak out dogmatically on the

---

[23]Willson, p. 198.

[24]In this appeal to Casaubon, Thomson complained that Abbot was attempting to turn Andrewes against him, and begged Casaubon to intercede with Andrewes on his behalf. See Pattison, pp. 350-52.

[25]Matthew Wren (1586-1667) received a B.D. in 1615, was appointed chaplain to Prince Charles and accompanied him to Spain. In 1625 he became Master of Peterhouse.

details of predestination theology was itself indicative of an anti-Calvinist point of view. Contrary to the Calvinists he maintained that these details were God's mysteries, not revealed to man, and therefore not matters of dogma relevant to salvation. In other words, they were, in the language of the period, of "things indifferent." He maintained that,

> ...a false conceit is crept into the minds of men, To think, the points of Religion, that be manifest, to be certain petty points, scarce worth the hearing; those, yea, those be great, and none but those, that have great Disputes about them. It is not so...Those that are necessary He hath made plain: those, that not plain, not necessary...[26]

In various sermons Andrewes made much of the mystery of predestination, and of the attempt to make dogma of the unrevealed. Although he never directly mentioned the Calvinists as the authors of such efforts, the inference was clear enough.

> God's "judgments," which are the fountain of reprobation, are abyssus magna; and His mercy, extended to all that by faith apprehend the same, abyssus et profunditas, "a great depth." Therefore we are not curiously to enquire and search out of God's secret touching reprobation or

---

[26] Lancelot Andrewes, The Works of Lancelot Andrewes Sometime Bishop of Winchester ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," /Oxford, 1841-54/), I, 35.

> election, but to adore it.[27]
>
> ...even some that are far enough from Rome, yet with their new perspective they think they perceive all God's secret decrees, the number and order of them clearly; are indeed too bold and too busy with them.[28]

Despite his reluctance to touch upon the "mysteries," Andrewes did speak out on some of the points of controversy. In his Passion Sermon of April 6, 1604, he affirmed the universality of Christ's redemption, and the power of man's will to accept or reject the proffered salvation.

> ...it pertains to all, but all pertain not to it. None pertain to it but they that take benefit by it; and none take benefit by it no more than by the brazen serpent, but they that fix their eye on it. Behold, consider and regard it; the profit, the benefit is lost without regard.[29]

He went further than either Luther or Article XII of the Thirty-nine Articles in teaching that good works, more than being a reflection of a living faith, were vital to that faith. Without such works faith in his view was dead and useless in terms of salvation.[30]

But the Calvinistic doctrine that Andrewes opposed

---

[27] Ibid., V, 398.

[28] Ibid., III, 328.

[29] Ibid., II, 155.

[30] Ibid., II, 93-94; and XI, 29.

most vehemently was the doctrine of security and assurance. In addition to his comments on the Lambeth Articles and his Censura Censurae D. Barreti de Certitudine Salutis, he attacked the doctrine in his sermons. As early as 1594 he preached that perseverance was attainable only "if we can possess our souls with the due care, and rid them of security..."[31] In a later sermon he devoted himself to the precise problem that had bothered Overall at the Hampton Court Conference, i.e., the effect of the presumption of salvation on the ethical life of the believer. Andrewes warned that although many thought that the doctrine of security of salvation was good divinity, such a doctrine could easily lead men astray. With echoes of Arminius's charge that God's justice could be no less than man's own, he argued that the decree of election did not operate in a sphere irrespective of man.

> Let no man deceive you through vain words; he that doth righteousness is righteous, and he that doth unrighteousness, is of the devil.[32]

At no time did Andrewes make a direct attack on the Calvinists or their full theology of predestination. In the Dutch sense he was not an Arminian at all; he was not a crusader for an enlightened theology of predestination. A peaceful academician and churchman who would avoid discord

---

[31] Ibid., II, 72.

[32] Ibid., V, 53.

whenever possible, he was a man after James's very own heart. His liberal theology was a quiet, personal thing. He never brought his creative thought to systematic fruition, and did not speak out on the controversial points except when presumption of the opposition left him no alternative.

Consequently, it is not surprising that Andrewes attempted to avoid any commitment to the Arminians in the Dutch controversy. His reputation as a liberal (which to many meant an Arminian sympathizer) and his high position at court made his attempt at neutrality a difficult position to maintain. Quite unwillingly Andrewes was pulled into the Dutch affair. Bertius, the author of the De Apostasia Sanctorum so despised by James, was known to have put it out that Andrewes and William Barlow (the author of one account of the Hampton Court Conference) were of his opinion.[33] More important, when Grotius visited England in 1613 Andrewes was directly confronted with the Dutch problem.

There is no doubt that Grotius, knowing Andrewes's theological predilections, planned to use him to gain support for the Remonstrant cause. In his first letter home to Barnevelt, he wrote:

> In case your excellency concludes that something could be done here towards the settlement of our controversy, we shall have to find how far we can go, and in what way we should

---

[33]Abbot to Winwood, Lambeth, June 1, 1613, Winwood, III, 460.

> approach the subject in the pulpit. To make a suggestion, I think it could be arranged that we could use the Bishop of Ely [Andrewes] and the dean [Overall] and M. Casaubon for this purpose.[34]

And further on:

> I meanwhile am not remiss in the good cause, and am inciting Ely to use the liberty he ought.[35]

The pressure brought to bear on Andrewes in this cause was not entirely subtle. On one occasion, as his contemporary, Abbot, relates, Casaubon, Grotius, Richardson, a Doctor Steward and another Cambridgeman were guests at Andrewes's home. Grotius spent the evening elaborating on "some of those Questions which are now controverted among the Ministers in Holland." Andrewes's specific remarks on the subject are not known. But at his final audience with James, Grotius referring to the dinner party remarked:

> I do perceive that your great Men do not all agree in those Questions now controverted amongst us; for in talking with my Lord of Ely, I perceive that he is of Opinion that a Man that is truly justifyed and sanctifyed. may excidere a gratia although not finaliter yet totaliter.[36]

James, knowing that Andrewes did hold this opinion

---

[34] Grotius to Barnevelt, London, April 19, 1613, Molhuysen, I, 231-2.

[35] Ibid., p. 239.

[36] Abbot to Winwood, Lambeth, June 1, 1613, Winwood, III, 459.

privately, but "being told the King's Judgment of it had made Shew to desist from broaching any such thing," complained to Abbot of Andrewes's indiscretion, particularly to a stranger. Not one to let such an opportunity go by default, Abbot approached Andrewes who "with earnest Asserveration" denied that he had "used any such Speech" to Grotius.[37] Moreover he offered to write directly to Grotius, by this time back in Holland, to demand explanation for so quoting him to the King. Following the advice of Abbot he did not send the letter, and consequently did not remove himself from the controversy.

His name and reputation continued to be used by the Arminians in Holland. In October of 1617 Carleton wrote to his friend, John Chamberlain, that the Arminians claimed to have in their possession some letters of Andrewes supporting their position. He asked Chamberlain to find out from Andrewes the exact status of these letters. At his meeting with Chamberlain regarding the matter, Andrewes noted that he had once given Whitgift a paper containing arguments similar to those of the Arminians. That paper had disappeared; a copy had been lent to Richard Hooker who had never returned it. But Andrewes denied ever having written any such letters to any Dutch Arminian. As for the theological issues involved, "he expressed not all the while

---

[37] Ibid.

which opinion he inclined to..."[38]

There is little doubt that Andrewes's private sympathies were with the Dutch Arminians, and it is possible that in one way or another he conveyed that sympathy to Grotius.[39] He certainly conveyed it to Chamberlain in his dry comment that the Synod of Dort was "the first generall Sinod that ever was held with one bishop."[40] Furthermore Andrewes did maintain a correspondence with Grotius, and the two were sufficiently intimate by 1618 for Grotius to write to him from prison requesting him "to do what you can, as I know you will, to alleviate my bad situation."[41] Even

---

[38] John Chamberlain to D. Carleton, London, October 31, 1617, Norman Egbert McClure, (ed.), The Letters of John Chamberlain (Philadelphia, 1939), II, 110-11.

[39] In a report to Barnevelt (April 19, 1613) Grotius related a detailed conversation with Andrewes over a work recently published in England entitled Petri Baronis Summa Trium de Praedestinatione Sententiarum...Quibus Accedunt Assertions Orthodoxae Seu Articuli Lambethani (1615). In addition to Baro's treatise the work also contained two orations of Whitaker on predestination and on some of the Lambeth Articles. Grotius claimed that Andrewes had told him that Whitaker's presentation at Lambeth was entirely different from that presented in the above work, and that the Lambeth Articles were not intended to give victory to either party, and in fact, had no status in the English Church. See Molhuysen, I, 231-2.

[40] Chamberlain to Carleton, London, November 28, 1618, McClure, II, 186.

[41] "Letter from Hugo de Groot to L. Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester," undated, printed in Transactions of the Grotius Society, XXII (1938), 135. Although Andrewes never admitted responding to Grotius's letters, it is not likely that the Dutchman would continue to write if he never received a response.

Chamberlain suspected that there was more than met the eye in the relationship between Grotius and Andrewes. Reporting a meeting at which Andrewes had admitted receiving correspondence from Grotius, Chamberlain wrote to Carleton in 1618:

> ...I perceve by this that he holdes him for a very learned and able man, yet I doubt not but this little conference will serve him for a caveat hereafter.[42]

Intellectually and politically, if not theologically, in tune with his monarch, Andrewes was in no need for such a "caveat."

Like Andrewes, John Overall as a known "sympathizer" and intimate of James's circle at court was susceptible to pressure on the part of the Dutch Remonstrants. But unlike Andrewes, Overall was outspoken on the Dutch affair, and consequently, according to one student of the period, "politically naive."[43]

Overall was introduced to Grotius when the latter came to England in 1613. He was the only English divine (excluding Casaubon who was "English" only by adoption) who kept in continuous, open and sympathetic contact with the Dutch leader throughout the Arminian controversy. In July of 1616 he responded to Grotius's fear that their corre-

---

[42]Chamberlain to Carleton, London, February 21, 1618, McClure, II, 141.

[43]Pamp, p. 268.

spondence would be used against Overall:

> ...believe me...that nothing can be more welcome to me than your Letters; and that I fear no slander of any mortal man, with respect to this your affair of Predestination and Divine Grace, a cause so just, so holy and so reasonable, for in this matter, it is a very small thing with me, that I should be judged of men's judgment.[44]

Unlike his fellow churchmen he was not the least reticent about expressing his sympathy with the Remonstrants.

> ...I rejoice to learn from your Letter...that the moderate, nay I might say the better and truer opinion concerning Predestination gets ground among you daily. God grant it may do so, yet more and more![45]

And in 1617

> I shall return to London in the beginning of October and if I can promote your cause, which I constantly recommend to God in my prayers, I shall not neglect it.[46]

Despite his encouragement of Grotius, Overall did not fully commit himself theologically to the Remonstrant position. He considered the Arminian theology of predestination the "better and truer opinion;" he did not describe it as the "best and the true opinion." In fact some time between 1610 and 1619 he wrote a summary of the five

---

[44]Quoted in Brandt, II, 260-61.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Ibid., p. 314.

Articles of Controversy in the Low Countries in which he described the position of the Church of England (and presumably his own) as between the extreme of the Remonstrants and contra-Remonstrants.[47]

The basic theme of the tract deserves close attention. It centers upon a distinction between sufficient and efficacious grace similar to that made by the English delegation at Dort. But whereas the Dort delegates limited the application of the distinction to the question of the universality of Christ, Overall took it to its logical conclusions and applied it to all five of the controverted points.

In respect to predestination, the Remonstrants taught that God elected and damned men on the bases of a general decree conditional upon faith and a special and absolute decree arising from prescience of men's choices and behavior. The contra-Remonstrants, at the other extreme, excluded a general, conditional decree, and maintained only "an exclusive particular and absolute Decree respecting certain individuals selected out of the human race" that was "irresistible."[48] The Church of England, says Overall, joined the particular absolute decree of the contra-

---

[47]Overall's Articles of Controversy in the Low Countries is reprinted in William Goode, The Doctrine of the Church of England As to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants (London, 1850), pp. 127-33.

[48]Ibid., p. 128.

Remonstrants with the general, conditional decree of the Remonstrants. God first proposed salvation through Christ for all who would believe. Then, that he "might help human infirmity," he granted to a select few a special, more efficacious grace "by which not only they might be able to believe or obey, if so inclined, but also actually be inclined, believe, obey, and persevere."[49]

The doctrine of the universality of Christ's atonement followed logically. Avoiding the extremes of the Remonstrants and the contra-Remonstrants, the Church of England taught the universality of Christ's atonement in the sense of sufficient grace offered to all, and limited atonement in the sense of the additional special grace offered only to the elect.

All three positions agreed that free will could do nothing without the accompaniment of grace. But the Remonstrants claimed that grace was so joined with the "Word," that all who were willing follow and obey, to some degree possessed grace. The contra-Remonstrants claimed that grace was peculiar to the elect. The Church of England, in line with its subdivision of grace into general, sufficient, and special, efficacious, taught that the former was granted to all, and the latter only to the elect.[50]

---

[49] Ibid., p. 129.

[50] Ibid., p. 130.

And where the Remonstrants maintained the resistibility of grace, and the contra-Remonstrants the irresistibility, the Church of England attributed resistibility to general grace, and a peculiar kind of irresistibility to special grace.

> ...although the will is able to resist it, on account of its liberty, yet it does not resist, but certainly and infallibly complies...[51]

On the last point - perseverance - the Church of England taught, like the Remonstrants, that believers could fall totally and even finally from grace, but like the contra-Remonstrants, that those recipients of special grace did "so persevere in a true and lively faith, that at length they are brought to eternal life."[52]

Politically, the theology of Overall's tract was extremely astute. On each point it encompassed the views of both parties, and thus granted nothing to either side. Moreover, by granting everything and consequently nothing, the work could not be offensive to James. Overall showed himself the master of that moderation which James so vehemently espoused.

It is also possible that the work was an ingenious way of condemning the Synod of Dort on the basis of the

---

[51] Ibid., p. 131.

[52] Ibid., p. 132. On this point Overall went further than Baro had in his dispute with the Heads of Cambridge.

theology espoused by the English delegation. As the date of the work is not known, it is possible that it was written after the English delegation had reached its compromise on the universality issue, and this compromise had become known to the churchmen at court.[53] Overall's whole theology was based upon the distinction between efficacious and sufficient grace made by James's own delegation to Dort. Overall simply applied that distinction to all the controverted points, an application that neither the English delegation nor the Synod itself was willing to make. In no way could the theology of the Articles of Controversy... be reconciled with the final canons promulgated at Dort. But at the same time the work was safe from attack as unorthodox, because it was based upon the work of the English delegates which James acclaimed. If this be the case, there is no contradiction between Overall's enthusiastic support of Grotius and his tract. The purpose of the Articles of Controversy... was not to disassociate the Church of England from the theology of the Remonstrants, but to discredit the Synod which condemned that theology. And it is known that, however pleased James may have been with the work of that

---

[53] The English delegation reported their compromise to Abbot and to Carleton in February and March of 1619. The Synod ended in April 1619. Overall died on May 12 of the same year. Thus it is possible that Overall wrote this treatise in the few months before his death.

Synod, Overall was far from feeling such pleasure.[54]

The third "Arminian sympathizer" at James's court was neither a Cambridge man nor an English churchman. Isaac Casaubon had been born in Geneva, and from there had migrated to France where he gained great reputation as a patristic scholar. He had been brought up as a Calvinist, and as a professor of Greek in Geneva had established a close personal relationship with Theodore Beza.[55] But in France he began to waver from his orthodoxy. At one point he considered conversion to Roman Catholicism, but finally turned instead to the Church of England.

His scholarship had been known to James while the latter was still in Scotland, and when Casaubon became interested in visiting England in 1610, James, under the influence of Andrewes, had Archbishop Bancroft make the formal invitation.[56] In fact Casaubon's visit was really an attempt to see "whether the condition that is offered him for the settling him there shall be his liking."[57] And indeed the conditions offered were quite magnanimous. James, taken with the scholarly table talk of his visitor, offered

---

[54]In a letter to Grotius written in 1621 John Cosin commented on the impressions Overall's sorrow at the developments in the Low Countries had made upon him. See Pamp, note, p. 264.

[55]Pattison, pp. 56 ff.

[56]Ibid., pp. 264, 292.

[57]Sir Thomas Edmondes to Winwood, Paris, October 6, 1610, Winwood, III, 226.

him a pension from his own already depleted purse in addition to a prebend of Canterbury. Consequently Casaubon settled in England, living there from 1610 until his death in 1614.

During his four years in England Casaubon did not continue his Greek scholarship; instead, to his sorrow, his time was fully occupied with James's pamphlet warfare against Rome.[58] Despite this forced preoccupation, Casaubon was not interested in theological controversy. We are able to ascertain the details of his theological sympathy with the Arminians only by turning to a record of a conversation he had had with Uytenbogaert in 1610 while he was still in France.[59] At that time Casaubon maintained that the Calvinistic concept of reprobation and predestination made it appear that God was the author of evil, that Calvin had distorted St. Augustine's teachings on free will, and that the place of good works in salvation was not sufficiently stressed in the Calvinistic system.[60]

Once in England Casaubon maintained the public silence on predestination theology demanded by his patron king, and his Arminian leanings were known only to a few.[61] But in

---

[58] Pattison, pp. 284-86.

[59] The conversation was recorded by Uytenbogaert, but there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.

[60] Pattison, pp. 222-24.

[61] Ibid., p. 383.

those four years his only close associates were of the Arminian inclination: "Dutch" Thomson (who was a friend from former years), Lancelot Andrewes, John Overall, and during his two-month visit, Hugo Grotius. Casaubon had been in correspondence and ecclesiastical sympathy with Grotius before they met in 1613. On meeting, the friendship between the two was cemented and extended into a continued correspondence until Casaubon's death. It was through Casaubon that Grotius was introduced to Andrewes and Overall, and in one sense Casaubon became the Dutchman's liaison with the English Arminians. Casaubon had only praise for the intellect and character of Grotius.

> I knew him before to be a wonderful man; but the superiority of that divine genius no one can properly appreciate, without seeing his countenance, and hearing his conversation. Integrity is stamped on his face; in his talk is exhibited the union of exquisite learning and genuine piety. Nor is it I only who am so taken with our visitor; all the learned and good who have been introduced to him have fallen under the spell, and the king more than any one.[62]

Casaubon died before James reversed himself in favor of the Dutch party that would sentence Grotius to death. It is difficult, if not impossible, to guess what his reaction might have been. He might well have condemned James's policy if not his theology. If he had done so, it is almost

---

[62]Quoted in Pattison, p. 307.

certain that he would have lost favor with the English monarch who valued obedience more than any theology.

Although English Arminianism had been "born" at Cambridge, and was intellectually cultivated by Cambridge-educated churchmen at James's court, Oxford did not lack its share of dissenters from Calvinist theology. There were, however, two basic differences between the dissent at the two Universities. At Cambridge the predestination theology aspect of anti-Calvinism was isolated by the Barret-Baro controversy in the 1590's from the other aspects of Calvinism which were inacceptable to the unorthodox. At Oxford predestination theology had no such focus of dissent. Consequently, it is frequently difficult to ascertain the extent to which dissent was in fact "Arminian." Secondly, the tradition of academic Arminianism was not so strong at Oxford as at Cambridge. The Oxford Arminians, unlike their brothers, tended to become activists - political ecclesiastics as opposed to intellectual churchmen of the calibre of Andrewes and Overall.

The prominent anti-Calvinists at Oxford included such men as John Howson,[63] John Buckeridge, and a group of younger scholars which included William Laud and William Juxon. The last three mentioned were all associated with St. John's College, which was founded by a Catholic, and

---

[63]See Chapter III of this study.

was generously supported by Sir William Paddy, a former student there and a strong advocate of anti-Calvinist views.

John Buckeridge was an anti-Calvinist of the late Elizabethan generation which had looked to Lancelot Andrewes at Cambridge for inspiration. In 1605 he became president of St. John's, but in the years immediately preceding that appointment he had served the anti-Calvinist cause well as the tutor of one William Laud who came to St. John's in 1589, and who succeeded Buckeridge as its president in 1611. William Juxon came to Oxford and St. John's in 1602 and remained there until 1633, having succeeded Laud in the presidency in 1621. Although all three men were to become vital participants in the Laudian movement (of which Arminianism was a part), Laud was the most outspoken in their day at Oxford.

Laud was at Oxford during the years in which James was making and remaking his policy regarding the issue of Dutch Arminianism. The Oxford years of Laud remain obscure, yet it is apparent that at no time during that period did he address himself specifically to the Dutch predestination controversy.[64] Moreover there are extant no sermons or

---

[64]According to Trevor-Roper "...we know practically nothing about Laud's life at Oxford." "We cannot follow in Laud the growth of those ideas which he held so strongly or ascribe dates or causes." (H.R. Trevor-Roper, Archbishop Laud 1573-1645 /London, 1940/, pp. 32-33.)

treatments by Laud of the predestination question in general. But it is possible to ascertain from the limited material available that Laud indirectly did speak out against Calvinistic predestination theology.

On several occasions the young scholar aroused the ire of the Calvinistic authorities by his lack of orthodoxy. At least two of these occasions involved predestination theology. Either upon receiving his B.D. or his D.D. degree, Laud preached on the necessity of episcopacy and the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.[65] This latter topic was closely related to the predestination issue of universal vs. limited atonement through Christ. Since Laud upheld the doctrine of regeneration through baptism, as opposed to the Calvinist position that baptism was merely an outward sign and not the transmission of grace, it can be assumed that he also held the theology of universal atonement.[66]

In 1612 Laud delivered another controversial sermon the topic of which is unknown. Immediately thereafter he was attacked from the pulpits of St. Peter's and St. Mary's

---

[65] See Laud, Works..., VII, 4; Trevor-Roper, pp. 37-39; William H. Hutton, The English Church From the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714) (London, 1903), pp. 6-12; W.C. Costin, History of St. John's College, Oxford (Oxford, 1958), pp. 27-30; and J.B. Mozley, Essays Historical and Theological (London, 1878), I, 117-19.

[66] Whether this was the doctrine of universal atonement advanced by Overall, i.e., the extension of sufficient but not efficacious grace, or in fact, the Arminian position of grace conditional upon free will and faith is not known.

by Robert Abbot, brother of the future archbishop, Master of Balliol, and Regius Professor of Divinity.

> Might not Christ say, What art thou, Romish or English, Papist or Protestant? Or what art thou? - a mongrel compound of both: a Protestant by ordination, a Papist in point of free-will, inherent righteousness, and the like. A Protestant in receiving the Sacrament; a Papist in the doctrine of the Sacrament. What, do you think there be two Heavens? If there be, get you to the other and place yourselves there, for into this where I am ye shall not come.
>
> ...they speak nothing but that wherein one Papist will speak against another, as against equivocation, the Pope's temporal power, and the like, and perhaps some of their blasphemous speeches; but in the points of free-will, justification, concupiscence being a sin after baptism, inherent righteousness, and certainty of salvation, the Papists beyond the seas can say they are wholly theirs, and the recusants at home make their boast of them...[67]

Laud was present at the second preaching of the sermon, and complained to Richard Neile, then Bishop of Lincoln, who advised him to keep his patience.[68] Apparently Laud's consent to this advice did not mean the end of the incident. He was called to London, but as the following letter indicates, he was allowed to return to Oxford, not

---

[67] Quoted in Heylyn, Cyprianus..., p. 67. Underlining mine.

[68] Laud, VII, 3, 4.

only uncensured, but with Abbot's apology.

> My good L.
>
> I moved his Ma. this day touchinge Dr. Laudes returne to Oxforde, to wch. his Ma. answered, Yes, for there is no cause yt he should staye. I have made a full and quiet ende of all those matters. I was bold to saye, then Dr. Laude shall have peace, and be no more trobled in yt matter. No, sayd his Ma. my L.G. him selfe acknowledged his brother's error in it, and Dr. Abbots him selfe asked pardon for it, excusinge himselfe yt, he was put to it, for yt all ye Universitye did understande yt. Dr. Laudes was upon him. If ye Dr. wilbe gon before I com, commende me to him.[69]

From this rather scant information it can be assumed that Laud and his friends did hold some of the views that came to be identified with Arminian theology. Rushworth described Laud as Arminian "in those times,"[70] and Costin claims that a dispute over Laud's election to the presidency of St. John's was due to "the religious animosity between the Calvinists and Arminians."[71]

Laud's later direct statements on Arminius and

---

[69] Ibid., VII, note, p. 4. James's role in procuring this apology is not clear. James did not yet oppose the discussion of predestination in the schools. At this time his opposition was to public controversy (which in this case was instigated by Abbot). Only after he had committed himself against the Dutch Arminians did James oppose discussion of predestination even from the University pulpit.

[70] Rushworth, I, p. 62.

[71] Costin, p. 27.

Arminian theology are not very revealing of his personal theology. In his account of his "Troubles and Trial," Laud wrote:

> ...about Arminianism, as maintained by me against the Declarations of both Houses of Parliament, and of King James, concerning Vorstius and Bertius. First, I have nothing to do to defend Arminianism, no man having yet charged me with abetting any point of it. Secondly, King James his declaration is very learned: but under favour, he puts a great deal of difference between Vorstius and Bertius: and his Majesty's opinion is clear with the article of the Church of England, and so expressed by himself: and to which I ever consented. And the passage in the conference at Hampton-Court was then read to the Lords, and yet for the peace of Christendom, and the strengthening of the reformed religion, I do heartily wish these differences were not pursued with such heat and animosity, in regard that all the Lutheran Protestants are of the very same opinions, or with very little difference from those which are now called Arminianism.[72]

Later, when charged with supporting a Scottish Arminian, Laud was more specific, and yet hardly clear, about his own theology.

> ...I do not know that ever Mr. Michell preached Arminianism. For that Christ died for all men is the universal and constant doctrine of the Catholic Church in all ages, and no "error of Arminius": and are the express words of Scripture itself, in more places than one.

---

[72]Laud, IV, 267.

> And the Synod of Dort, called purposely about the errors of Arminius, allows this for orthodox Christum mortuum esse pro omnibus. And for my part I wish with all my heart, that this had been the greatest error of Arminius.[73]

The implications of this statement are deceiving. In fact Laud's sympathies with Arminian theology went beyond the doctrine of universality. In another piece written during his imprisonment Laud stated:

> ...Mr Pryn himself (who hath been a great stickler in these troubles of the Church) says expressly, 'Let any true saint of God be taken away in the very act of any known sin, before it is possible for him to repent; I make no doubt or scruple of it, but he shall as surely be saved as if he had lived to have repented of it'... So according to this divinity, the true saints of God may commit horrible and crying sins, die without repentance, and yet be sure of salvation; which teareth up the very foundations of religion, induceth all manner of profaneness into the world, and is expressly contrary to the whole current of the Scripture.[74]

As for the supralapsarian theology of reprobation, Laud labelled it an "opinion my very soul abominates."

> For it makes God, the God of all mercies, to be the most fierce and unreasonable tyrant in the world. For the question is not here, what God may do by an absolute act of power, would He so use it upon the creature which He made of nothing: but what He hath done, and what

---

[73] Ibid., III, 304-05.

[74] Ibid., VI, 132-33.

> stands with His wisdom, justice and goodness to do.[75]

Thus, although he directly defended Arminianism only in terms of its teachings on the universality of grace (i.e., the position upheld at Dort), his attacks on the extreme doctrines of indefectibility and reprobation would indicate a certain degree of sympathy with the Arminian teachings on these doctrines as well.

Moreover in the late 1620's Laud lent his unequivocal support to a churchman who claimed that none of the Calvinistic positions on the five controverted points were in fact the teachings of the Church of England. Concerning that churchman, Richard Montague, Laud wrote:

> ...he is a very good scholar, and a right man; a man every way able to do God, his Majesty, and the Church of England great service.

Of the views expressed by Montague:

> ...the opinions which at this time trouble many men in the late work of Mr. Montague, are, some of them, such as are expressly the resolved doctrine of the Church of England... Some of them, such as are fit only for schools, and to be left at more liberty for more learned men to abound in their own sense...to make any man subscribe to school-opinions may justly seem hard in the Church of Christ...

And of the Lambeth Articles and the Synod of Dort:

> ...we are certain, that all or most

---

[75] Ibid., VI, 133.

> of the contrary opinions [i.e., contrary to Montague] were treated of at Lambeth, and ready to be published, but then Queen Elizabeth, of famous memory, upon notice given how little they agreed with the practice of piety and obedience to all government, caused them to be suppressed; and so they have continued ever since, till of late some of them have received countenance at the Synod of Dort. Now, this was a Synod of that nation, and can be of no authority in any other national Church till it be received there by public authority; and our hope is that the Church of England will be well advised, and more than once over, before she admit a foreign Synod, especially of such a Church as condemneth her discipline and manner of government to say no more.[76]

In the years under consideration in this study Laud was not only a supporter of Richard Montague, but also a member of the group of unorthodox churchmen who were frequent visitors at Durham House. The group was headed by Richard Neile, a great favorite with James, and through whom Laud himself slowly gained influence with the king.[77]

---

[76] Ibid., 244-46.

[77] It was Neile who convinced James not to intervene in Laud's disputed election to the presidency of St. John's College in 1612, who got Laud appointed as one of James's chaplains, and who most likely intervened on Laud's behalf in the Robert Abbot affair of 1613. But Neile was unable to get Laud a bishopric. Only Buckingham was able to get Laud that promotion in spite of James's fears of Laud's "restless spirit." When the bishopric did come to Laud in 1621 (the see of St. David's), James gave in to Buckingham with the words "Take him to you, but on my soul, you will repent it."

The Durham House group also included Richard Montague, John Buckeridge (consecrated Bishop of Rochester in 1611), Augustine Lindsell, a scholar who was to become Bishop of Peterborough and Hereford, John Cosin, secretary to John Overall until 1619, and thereafter chaplain to Neile.[78]

Although Trevor-Roper has termed Neile "the practical leader of the Arminians during the reign of James I," and Durham House "the party headquarters" of the movement,[79] none of these churchmen wrote or preached on predestination theology. The only indication of the group's commitment to that doctrine is their unanimous support of Richard Montague although even this varied in degree. Laud's circle of friends in these early years and his later disciples were, unlike Andrewes and the Cambridge Arminians, practical men whose task was not "to formulate a policy, or to consecrate it by doctrinal exegesis, but to carry it out..."[80]

As for James and the "practical" Arminians, the monarch's reticence about Laud's controversiality did not extend to the less controversial Buckeridge, Howson, and Neile. In the years before Laud finally received his first bishopric (St. David's in 1621), Neile advanced from the sees of Rochester (1608) to Lichfield and Coventry (1610),

---

[78] Heylyn, Cyprianus..., p. 69.

[79] Trevor-Roper, pp. 39, 56.

[80] Ibid., p. 31.

to Lincoln (1614), to Durham (1617), and to Winchester (1618).[81] Buckeridge succeeded Neile at Rochester in 1611, and the Calvinist Nicholas Felton at Ely in 1619; while Howson was consecrated to the see of Oxford.[82]

But James's policy was not one sided. Once he had finally decided on a course to run in regard to the Dutch Arminians, he was quick to discourage both those who would speak to the contrary, and those who would create controversy by debating the controverted points of predestination theology.

The first recorded instance of James enforcing an anti-Arminian policy at home was in 1617. One Edward Simpson, a fellow of Trinity College, preached a sermon before James at Royston in which he "fell upon a point of Arminius's doctrine touching universalitie of grace."[83]

---

[81] His elevation to the see of York came after James's death.

[82] Of the forty-one bishops consecrated during his reign, James promoted fourteen. Of these fourteen, seven were known to have Arminian sympathies. See D.E. Kennedy, "The Jacobean Episcopate," Historical Journal, V, no. 2 (1962), 177-81. In his study of James, D.H. Willson notes that in the selection and promotion of bishops, "James's personal preferences played a great part..." This is illustrated by "the number of royal chaplains who rose to be bishops" (p. 212).

[83] John Chamberlain to D. Carleton, London, December 20, 1617, McClure, II, 121. The same letter is included in Birch, The Court and Times of James I, II, 116. But in the Birch edition Simpson is referred to as "one Singleton of Trinity College, Cambridge," and the date of the letter is given as December 20, 1618. The Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1611-18, p. 504, dates the letter as December 20,

With John 3:6 as his text, Simpson first argued against the doctrine of indefectibility, and then asserted that in the seventh chapter of Romans, St. Paul spoke as an unregenerate, sub statu legis.

According to Heylyn, James could not have been offended by the first part of the sermon because when Overall had made the same point at Hampton Court in 1604, James not only had accepted, but had openly concurred with the point. The offense therefore came from Simpson's interpretation of Romans VII.[84]

The description of the sermon in a letter of John Chamberlain and in the report of the Venetian ambassador as "touching universality of grace" supports Heylyn's contention that James objected only to the latter part of the sermon.[85] But Heylyn's reasoning that James opposed

---

1617, and mentions "Simpson of Trinity College." See Heylyn, Historia Quinquarticularis..., p. 632; Collier, VII, 389; and Fuller, The History of the University of Cambridge..., p. 223 on the Simpson episode.

[84]See Harrison, Beginnings... for Arminius's interpretation of the seventh chapter of Romans.

[85]Chamberlain to Carleton, London, December 20, 1617, McClure, II, 121 and C.S.P.V., 1611-18, p. 504. The doctrine of indefectibility of grace does not touch on the universality of grace. But Simpson's interpretation of Romans VII does. Simpson, like Arminius, interpreted Romans VII as having been expressed by Paul before his regeneration. The Calvinists claimed that the faith and godliness expressed in that chapter could not be attributed to an

the second but not the first part of the sermon because he would not contradict the position he had taken at Hampton Court is inacceptable. Contradictions on points of theology were almost second nature to James. The Lambeth Articles had asserted the indefectibility of grace; James rejected them in 1604, but accepted them in 1615 for inclusion in the Irish Articles. Moreover, if Dudley Carleton is to be believed, in 1618 James wanted his English delegation at Dort to support the doctrine of universality of grace. If theological consistency is used as the measure of James's motivations, how can his offense at Simpson's interpretation of Romans VII and his instructions to the Dort delegation be reconciled?

Once again one cannot understand James by examining theologically his responses to particular theological points. James was responding neither to the theology of universal redemption nor to the doctrine of indefectibility. His response was to the fact that Simpson's interpretation was similar to that of Arminius whom James had condemned.[86] It was not so much a question of theology as a question of

---

unregenerate. To do so would attribute to unregenerate man a measure of grace and faith, thus implying that Christ's atonement granted some grace to all men, elect and non-elect alike.

[86]Heylyn does note that Simpson might not have been censured even for the second part of the sermon if it had not been for the fact that Arminius had declared himself of the same opinion (Historia Quinquarticularis..., p. 632).

obedience and monarchical pride.

As for Simpson, James ordered the Heads at Cambridge to examine and censure him. But the censure they brought forth - "that this and this may be saide" on the issue[87] - was not strong enough for James. He ordered all the Heads to meet with him at Newmarket at which meeting Simpson was ordered to preach a sermon of recantation before the king. The required sermon was preached, but therein Simpson "spake not a word of that was lookt for and enjoyned him."[88] Persistent, James ordered yet another sermon to be delivered by the young scholar. There is no record of this sermon, or of the subsequent academic career of Edward Simpson.[89]

James's problems with the Arminians were just beginning in 1617. On returning from the Synod of Dort, George Carleton noted that there were murmurings in corners, "but his Majesty's judgment puts all adversaries to silence and nothing is heard but approbation of those things which his

---

[87] Chamberlain to Carleton, London, December 20, 1617, McClure, II, 121.

[88] Ibid., p. 140.

[89] Fuller's account of the affair differs somewhat from that described in Chamberlain's letters. According to Fuller, James sent to only two unidentified professors at Cambridge, and these two proved and subscribed to James's own interpretation of Romans VII (History of the University of Cambridge..., p. 223). Collier follows Fuller, adding that Simpson submitted to the order for a public recantation (VII, 389). Both historians cite Heylyn's Historia Quinquarticularis... as their source.

Majesty approves."[90] This may have been true of the ecclesiastics at James's court, but in the universities and on the pulpits the situation was quite to the contrary. Thomas Goodwin noted in later years that as he was growing up, "the noise of the Arminian Controversy in Holland, at the Synod of Dort; and the several opinions of that controversy, began to be every man's talk and inquiry, and possessed my ears."[91] John Hacket in his life of Williams claimed that the decisions of Dort "awakened the opposition of divers scholars in our kingdom who lay still before. Learned and unlearned did begin to conflict every Sunday about God's eternal election, efficacy of grace in our conversion, and perseverance in it, with much noise and little profit to the people."[92]

The debate over the Synod and its judgments was not limited to Calvinists and Arminians. In 1620 there appeared a Baptist tract entitled A Description of What God Hath Predestinated Concerning Man.[93] Although the tract is not

---

[90]Quoted in Willson, p. 400.

[91]Thomas Goodwin, Works (London, 1704), V, p. x.

[92]John Hacket, Scrinia Reserata: A Memorial Offer'd to the Great Deservings of John Williams D.D.,...containing a series of the Most Remarkable Occurrences and Transactions of His Life. (London, 1693), Part I, 89. See also Fuller, The Church History..., V, 552-53 and Hardwick, p. 198.

[93]Edward Bean Underhill (ed., Tracts on Liberty of Conscience and Persecution 1614-61 /London, 1846/, p. 89) attributes the tract to one John Murton and his associates.

available, its general contents are summarized in the Calvinist reply of John Robinson, A Defence of the Doctrine Propounded By the Synode at Dort. The Baptist tract repeated the old charges against the Calvinist doctrine: God is made the author of sin and the author of Adam's fall. He hates and destroys without desert, and compels men by the force of his decree to all sorts of sinfulness and crime.[94] Positively the tract asserted the Arminian doctrines of universal grace, election based on prescience of man's reception of the gift of grace; the defectibility of grace, and man's free will to influence his own ultimate fate.[95]

The Calvinist reply, as propounded by John Robinson, also presented nothing new. On sin - "God is the "author of the action, or fact, but not of the sin or the fact of crime;"[96] on election - "...by the crosse doctrine of these men, we should chuse God, before God chuse us;" "To chuse, is to take some from the rest, and not to take all;"[97] on damnation - "God hates none before the world, otherwise then they are, and that they are no otherwise then in God's

---

[94]John Robinson, A Defence of the Doctrine Propounded By the Synode of Dort (London, 1624), pp. 2, 9, 86, 94.

[95]Ibid., pp. 52, 55-59, 99-100, 132-34.

[96]Ibid., p. 22.

[97]Ibid., pp. 52, 57.

decree, and foreknowledge;"[98] on perseverance - "perseverance in grace depends upon election;"[99] and on free will - "God works in us both the will and the deed."[100] The word "Arminian" occurs only once in the reply, in reference to the doctrine of perseverance.

> ...by their doctrine, God doth not elect any till they have continued to the end, in faith and obedience, that is till they be dead. And so actual and particular election, is not of men living, but dead; To which absurd assertion these mens Masters, the Arminians are driven.[101]

The public debate over predestination theology continued in the Universities. In July of 1622 one of Buckingham's own chaplains, William Lucy of Caius College, preached "a sermon strongly tinctured with Arminian views."[102] In the same year one observer wrote to a Dutch friend that at the Cambridge Commencement "he heard very warm disputes upon predestination, free will, and other kindred points, some stongly maintaining the side of the Remonstrants against Dr. Balcanqual."[103]

Exactly what James had feared had happened. Not only

---

[98] Ibid., p. 92.

[99] Ibid., p. 100.

[100] Ibid., p. 135.

[101] Ibid., p. 100.

[102] Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, II, 568.

[103] Russell, 485.

was a theology contrary to his own being publicly professed, but, more important, points of predestination theology were being controverted in his kingdom. The Dutch Arminian controversy with all its implied dangers of schism had spread to England. Fearing the schism and dissension "arising from the broaching of unprofitable, unsound, seditious, and dangerous doctrines, to the scandal of the Church and disquiet of the State and present government," James tried to squash the controversy by putting a direct limitation on preachers and the topics for public sermons. In 1622 he ordered Abbot to enforce rules which would silence Calvinist and Arminian alike.[104] In essence they incorporated the following points:

1. No scriptural text was to be interpreted in such a way as was not "comprehended and warranted in essence, substance, effect, or natural inference, within some one of the articles of religion set forth one thousand five hundred and sixty-two, or in some of the homilies set forth by authority of the Church of England..."

---

[104]In "The Church of England's Reaction from Calvinism in the Seventeenth Century," Religion in Life, XIII (Spring 1944), 219, Harrison claims that James's 1622 orders were indicative of his favoritism for the Arminians. He traces this favoritism to the influence of Laud. But Laud was not in such good favor with James in 1622. As previously noted, Laud's preference to the see of St. David's was due to the influence Buckingham had with the reluctant James. Contrary to Harrison's assertions, it would seem more likely that James's orders favored neither side, but rather attempted to implement a policy of silence in regard to the controverted theology. See Hacket, Part i, pp. 63-64.

2. The afternoon sermons which were not based on Scriptural texts, were to be based upon some part of the Catechism, the Creed, Ten Commandments, or the Lord's Prayer.

3. No preacher under the degree of bishop should publicly preach on "the deep points of predestination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresistibility of God's grace, but leave those themes rather to be handled by the learned men, and that moderately, and modestly by way of use and application, rather than by way of positive doctrines..."

4. No preacher was to presume to "declare, limit, or bound out, by way of positive doctrine, in any lecture or sermon, the power, prerogative, and jurisdiction, authority or duty of sovereign princes, or otherwise meddle with matters of state, and the differences between princes and the people," than as instructed in the homilies of obedience and articles of religion.

5. No preacher was to fall without cause into attacks and railings against either Papists or Puritans. When the text did present cause for such an attack, it was to be delivered "modestly and gravely."

6. The licensing of preachers was to be administered more strictly, and the power of license was to be restricted to the archbishops and the bishops of the kingdom.[105]

---

[105] Rushworth, I, 645.

As a deterrent to controversy in the Universities, the orders were hardly effectual. By 1623 the tenets of Arminius had gained many adherents at Oxford, the citadel of Puritanism. In January of that year Gabriel Bridges, Fellow of Corpus Christi, preached a sermon in St. Mary's Church in which he asserted the universality of grace, and the existence of some free will in man. On the 23rd of that month, at James's order, he was made to recant, and admit that he had preached "false and offensive doctrine concerning God's absolute Decree, universall Grace and Free-will."[106] Moreover, in his exercise for the B.D. degree, he was made to defend two Calvinist propositions on the same points: "Decretum praedestinationis non est conditionale;" and "Gracia sufficiens ad salutem non conceditur omnibus."[107]

The recantation of Bridges was by no means a victory comparable to the forced recantation of Barret at Cambridge in 1595-96. The Arminian faction at Oxford continued to present such a threat to the Calvinist students that they saw fit to hold meetings once every fortnight to handle "controversies relating to Arminianism, not for, but chiefly against it."[108]

---

[106] Wood, The History and Antiquities..., II, 349. See also Heylyn, Historia Quinquarticularis..., Part III, 10.

[107] Wood, The History and Antiquities..., II, 349.

[108] Ibid., II, 350.

There is no doubt that the Arminian controversy had come to England. However, there is some question as to whether it was anything more than an intellectual exercise completely unrelated to schism in the church and sedition in the state. Unfortunately James was unable to view the controversy outside of its Dutch context. With the immediate Dutch example and the more distant Scottish experience uppermost in his mind, James connected the theological debate with a real threat to his prerogative and his throne. This connection was reflected in his orders on preaching wherein he combined his efforts to bring an end to the predestination dispute (point three of the order) with an attempt to stay attacks on royal prerogative (point four of the order). To attribute this combination to coincidence would obfuscate the common factor unifying the Arminian policy which James implemented abroad and the policy he exercised at home.

The immediate impetus for the inclusion of point four in the order was a sermon preached in April of 1622 from the pulpit of St. Mary's by a young Oxford divine, William Knight.[109] In this sermon Knight argued that "yf kings grow unruly and tirannicall they may be corrected and

---

[109]Chamberlain to Carleton, London, April 27, 1622, McClure, II, 434. McClure erroneously identifies him as "John" Knight.

brought into order by theire subjects..."[110] Ironically, the source from which Knight had drawn the views expressed in his sermon was a work by David Pareus, a high ranking German Calvinist whose name and word were invoked by the Synod of Dort against the Arminians.[111]

If Pareus's theology of predestination was to James's liking, his political theory of the right of resistance was not. The theory appeared in a perfectly orthodox work denying the jurisdiction of the pope over the state policy of temporal monarchs (Commentary on the Romans). Almost as a summarizing aside Pareus raised the question in that work of whether resistance to civil rulers ever be lawful? In answer to his own hypothetical question, he asserted: bishops and clergy might and ought to resist passively impious and unjust rulers, exhorting them with the Word of God, and in the last resort, excommunicating them from the church. Private subjects may resist the tyrant ruler only when a direct attack is made against their lives and/or chastity. The point of such resistance is only to repel the attacker. Inferior magistrates alone are empowered with the responsibility to draw the sword in resistance to tyranny,

---

[110] Ibid. See also Wood, The History and Antiquities..., II, 341-42.

[111] Had it not been for his advanced age Pareus would have participated directly in the Synod. Instead his condemnation of the five articles of the Remonstrants was read to the Synod during the March 5 and 6 sessions. See Balcanqual, pp. 483-494.

and if necessary to depose the tyrant. It is their duty to defend themselves, the state, and the church against a civil power that would tyrannize the subjects, and/or desecrate the church.

The extent of James's hostility to this theory of resistance is evidenced in his response to Knight's sermon. Knight and two fellow collegians who had read the manuscript of the sermon before its delivery, were imprisoned; the Universities were advised that divinity students should apply themselves to the reading of Scriptures, ancient fathers and schoolmen "excluding those neotericks, both Jesuits and Puritans, who are knowne to be medlers in matters of State and monarchy."[112] The works of Pareus were condemned and publicly burned at Oxford, Cambridge, and at Paul's Cross in London.[113]

James's obsession with prerogative, legitimacy, and his horror of resistance - or worse, rebellion - overrode any concern he may have had with religion and theology. Because of this obsession he had had serious doubts about supporting the revolt of the Dutch Protestants against Spain. Religious affinities aside, the Dutch were rebels, and James would not support rebellion.

---

[112] Wood, The History and Antiquities..., II, 342.

[113] Ibid., II, 345. Oxford not only had his works burned, but had extracts from his assertions read and censured at a public convocation. An extract of that reading and censure transcribed from the University's records is reprinted in Collier, VII, 429-431.

> When speaking of the States he uses the term rebels, and declares that such a bad example should not be encouraged, nor would it ever have occurred had not the States found support. He blames the King of France, who, in violation of his good faith and purity of spirit, which every man and much more every King should preserve in fact, has fostered, not even secretly the States in their rebellion, hence the irritation of the Kings of Spain, which induced them to encourage plots inside the kingdom of France; nor does he blame the late Queen any loss for mixing herself up in affairs which brought her Crown to the verge of ruin.[114]

When he was told of the danger that Ostend would fall to Spain if English aid were withheld, he said: "What of it? Was not Ostend originally the King of Spain's and therefore now the Archdukes?"[115] On the same basis James refused to aid his son-in-law, the Palatine, in Bohemia. He had accepted the crown from rebels, and consequently was "a godless man and a usurper."[116]

James's concern with legitimacy was not simply an excuse for inaction. Indeed it was a sincere intellectual, as well as emotional, commitment. In 1606 he asked his

---

[114]Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli to Doge and Senate, London, May 28, 1603, C.S.P.V., 1603-07, pp. 40-41. See also Scaramelli to Doge and Senate, London, May 22, 1603, ibid., p. 34.

[115]Scaramelli to Doge and Senate, London, May 8, 1603, ibid., p. 20.

[116]Conversation between James and Gondomar, the French ambassador to England, quoted in Willson, p. 414. See also Girolamo Lando to Doge and Senate, London, April 24, 1620, C.S.P.V., 1619-21, pp. 239.

clergy to consider in Convocation "how far a Christian and protestant king may concur to assist his neighbours to shake off their obedience to their once sovereign upon the account of oppression..."[117] While absolutely denying the right of resistance to subjects, the canons drawn up in reply to James's question did affirm that a new government arising out of successful rebellion had divine authority and "is ever...to be reverenced and obeyed."[118] Horrified at this approval of what he believed to be inherently evil, James refused to accept the canons because he saw them as granting, by implication, divine authority to a successful usurpation of James's own throne.

> ...you leave me to seek for others to fight for it; for you tell us upon the matter before hand, his authority is God's authority, if he prevail.[119]

Religion entered into James's policy making only insofar as he saw dissension over religious matters, and particularly, theology, as a source of political trouble. In angry response to a petition for clemency in his enforce-

---

[117] D. Wilkins (ed.), Concilia Magnae Brittaniae et Hiberniae 446-1717 (London, 1731), IV, 405.

[118] Bishop Overall's Convocation-Book MDCVI Concerning the Government of God's Catholick Church and the Kingdoms of the Whole World ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," Oxford, 1844), p. 25.

[119] Wilkins, IV, 405. James must have been referring to the threat of Spain, and the possibility of the usurpation of his throne by that power.

ment of conformity, James once told his Council "that the revolt in the Low Countries, which had lasted ever since he was born and whereof he never expected to see an end, began first by a petition for matters of religion, and did all the troubles in Scotland..."[120] It was to avoid religious controversy that James urged moderation in theological matters.[121] Unlike Elizabeth, James himself was not a moderate theologically. He did not advocate moderation in order to set a particular tone to the Church, but in order to straddle issues and to avoid theological commitments. In spite of his Calvinism, and contrary to his reputation, James was not really interested in theology. His theological learning was "simply a collectors piece, less for the solution of enigmas than for spectacular display."[122]

As the Venetian ambassador astutely noticed:

> The King himself, though continuing a Protestant, would certainly be indifferent as to the question of

---

[120] Cardwell, Documentary Annals..., II, 64.

[121] For example note James's instructions to the Dort delegation quoted in Chapter IV. James was completely unaware of the irreconcilability of the conflict. The contra-Remonstrants were not to be satisfied with merely forbidding preaching on the controverted points, nor were they likely to moderate their own position on these points at a Synod which was entirely controlled by them.

[122] Trevor-Roper, p. 24. In his introduction to James's political writing, McIlwain depicts James in the same way. "Though priding himself more on his acuteness in theological disputation than on anything else, there is little real indication that he cared much for religion." (McIlwain, p. liv).

> religion did he not fear that this would breed discord among his people.[123]

Consequently, when called upon to respond theologically, James weighed not theological points, but the best means of preventing discord. This was the foundation of his condemnation of the Arminians in the Netherlands, and of his cultivation of Arminian churchmen at home. For the Arminians whom James advanced in the Church of England, either knowingly or unknowingly, calmed the fears that lay at the root of James's attitude toward the Dutch Arminians. With these churchmen James had no fear for his prerogative. Their lack of orthodoxy in predestination theology was well balanced by their strong affirmation of the divine right of kings and their condemnation of resistance.

Although it requires a look backwards, it seems advisable at this point to examine the type of political theory preached before James by such churchmen as Andrewes, Overall, and Neile.

Andrewes's exaltation of the monarchy appeared in his sermons, sixteen of which were devoted to expounding the origins, nature, and sacredness of kingship.[124] For almost

---

[123] Scaramelli to Doge and Senate, Egham, July 23, 1603, C.S.P.V., 1603-07, p. 68.

[124] In his earlier writing Andrewes had expounded a contract theory of government (The Works of Lancelot Andrewes Sometime Bishop of Winchester ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology" /Oxford, 1841-54/), VI, 198-99), but by the time he had become a bishop he no longer rested temporal sovereignty on popular consent. For detailed

twenty years he preached such sermons before James every August 5 and every November 5, the anniversaries of the Gowrie Conspiracy and the Gunpowder Plot. He assured James that his kingship was established by God,[125] and that true kings were "no human invention...neither 'chosen' nor 'exalted' by the people, but by God out of the people."[126] The "divine right" to rule was a right bestowed irrespective of character and religion, and in no way could be forfeited.

> Unxit in Regem, Royal unction gives no grace, but a just title only, in Regem, "to be King;" that is all, and no more. It is the administration to govern, not the gift to govern well; the right of ruling, not the ruling right. It includes nothing but a due title, it excludes nothing but usurpation. Who is "annointed"? On whom the right rests. Who is inunctus? He that hath it not...David, or he that first beginneth a royal race, is as the head; on him is that right of ruling first shed; from him it runs down to the next, and so still, even to the lowest borders of this lawful issue...It is for ever. God's claim never forfeits; His character never to be wiped out, or scraped out, nor Kings lose their right, no more than Patriarchs did their fatherhood.[127]

---

studies of Andrewes's political theory, see Reidy, pp. 185-212, and P. Welsby, "Lancelot Andrewes and The Nature of Kingship," Church Quarterly Review, CLVI (1955), 400-08.

[125] Andrewes, Works, II, 2-15 and V, 171-77.

[126] Ibid., IV, 53, 79. De facto rule did not constitute true kingship. Usurpers may reign, but they are not true kings.

[127] Ibid., IV, 58.

As God's annointed the king was inviolable. Allegiance and obedience were due him not because "he is virtuous, religious, or wise, but because he is christus Domini."[128] No one, not cleric, nor magistrate, nor subject, nor alien may touch God's annointed however tyrannical he be.

> They that rise against the King are God's enemies; for God and the King are so in a league, such a knot, so straight between them, as one cannot be enemy to the one but he must be to the other.[129]

John Overall was also an exponent of divine right monarchy. His political theory appears in the canons drawn up by Convocation in 1606 which were subsequently rejected by James. Overall was prolocutor of the lower house in the Convocation of Canterbury at the time the canons were drawn up. When they were rejected a manuscript copy of three completed books of the canons written in Overall's hand was preserved by Overall's secretary, John Cosin. In 1690 this manuscript was published by William Sancroft together with a manuscript copy of another book of the 1606 Convocation, with the title Bishop Overall's Convocation Book, MDCVI, concerning the Government of God's Catholick Church and the Kingdoms of the Whole World. Although Overall was not the sole author, it hardly can be assumed that the work would contain views which the proloc-

---

[128] Ibid.

[129] Ibid., pp. 13-17.

utor did not share.

The main theme of the book was the divine right of kings over bishops, and the divinely ordained authority of both king and bishop over the people. It traced the divine origin of both kingship and priesthood through the Old Testament carefully pointing out that, in spite of his divine origins, the priest could be deposed by the monarch, but not vice versa. Aside from the attack on presbyterian church form (i.e., the divine origins of the episcopacy), the work differed little from the theories of divine right and non-resistance presented by Andrewes in his sermons.

> When God first ordained Civil Magistrates, and gave them authority, his meaning was, that the people, whom they were to govern, should be subject to them... Subjection of Inferiors unto their Kings and Governors is grounded upon the very Law of Nature; and consequently that the Sentence of Death, awarded by God himself, against such as showed themselves disobedient and incorrigible to their Parents and cursed them or struck them, were likewise due unto those, who committed any such offence against their Kings or Rulers, being the Heads and Fathers of their Commonwealths and Kingdoms.[130]

The one major difference between Andrewes's and Overall's political theories appeared in the eighteenth canon where Andrewes's distinction between de facto and de jure govern-

---

[130] Bishop Overall's Convocation Book..., p. 23.

ments was eliminated.[131] As has been noted previously, it was because of this canon that the entire work of the Convocation was rejected.

The practical Oxfordian Arminian, Neile, did not set forth such political theory. But in his politics he went even further than the theory articulated by Andrewes and Overall. Edmund Waller relates an incident evidencing the extent of Neile's thorough-going acceptance of divine right monarchy. At a dinner with James, Andrewes and Neile were asked, "My Lords, cannot I take my Subjects' Money, when I want it, without all this Formality in Parliament?" Neile replied: "God forbid, Sir, but you shou'd, you are the Breath of our Nostrils." Andrewes, on the other hand, declined to answer James on the basis of incompetence in Parliamentary affairs. When pressed, he replied, "I think it's lawful for you to take my Brother Neal's money for he offers it."[132] Whether the story is anecdotal or true,[133] is unimportant, for in 1614 Neile expressed in the House of Lords the same view that is attributed to him in this relation.

The House of Commons had asked the Lords to confer

---

[131] Ibid., p. 25.

[132] Edmund Waller, "Life," in Poems Etc. (London, 1712), pp. vi-vii.

[133] Welsby is inclined to consider the story anecdotal (Lancelot Andrewes..., p. 202); while Willson tends to accept it as a factual account (p. 30).

with them on the issue of impositions. Neile addressed the House of Lords in opposition to the suggested joint conference with such vehemence as subsequently brought a complaint against him from the Lower House. The complaint stated that Neile "did use Words to the Effect following or worse:"

> That the Matter, whereof Conference was by that House desired, is a Noli me tangere; inferring also, that the taking of the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy is an Impediment, so as who so had taken the same Oaths might not safely enter into Conference of the said Matter; affirming further, that it did strike not at a Branch but at the Root of the Prerogative and Imperial Crown; and that he doubted lest, in such Conference as was desired, there would from some of the Committees of that House, proceed some undutiful and seditious Speeches, unfit for their Lordships to hear, tending to a dangerous Rent and Distraction of both Houses, and to make an Alienation between the King and his Subjects...[134]

James's very personal policy of supporting these "private" Arminians at home, while opposing Arminianism abroad was an extremely dangerous course to chart specifically because it was grounded not in the religious, but in the political philosophies expressed by, or attributed to, the two parties. It is not surprising, then, that before the end of his reign James should sow the dreaded seeds of political and religious disorder that his son would reap.

---

[134] Journals of the House of Lords..., II, 709. The full account of the incident is related in pages 705-712 passim.

James's "slip" came in 1624 when he gave his personal support to a work written by Richard Montague, one of the most theoretical of the "practical" Arminians. In 1618 he had written a refutation of John Selden's History of Tithes, an historical attack on the de jure basis for the tithe. James's concern with Selden's work and his appreciation of Montague's refutation of it were due chiefly to pressure from the clergy. But at the same time, one must not forget James's tendency to connect any threat to the Church to a threat to the throne. Certainly in James's mind it was but one step from the denial of the divine right of the clergy to tithes to a similar denial of the divine right of kings to their own form of subsidy.[135]

Thus James was already favorably disposed toward Montague when he wrote a work entitled A Gagg for the New Gospel? No: A New Gagg for an Old Goose. A reply to a Catholic tract, this work raised again the five controverted points of predestination theology and attempted to prove that the teachings of the Church of England were not, in fact, the teachings of the Calvinists.

The work immediately caught the attention of two Puritan preachers, Samuel Ward and John Yates of Ipswich,[136]

---

[135] Gardiner, The History of England..., III, 254-57.

[136] Collier (VII, 442) claims that Yates and Ward were acting, not for themselves but for the Calvinian party which was "conscious this book, if unanswered, would expose their singularities, and prevent the passing their private opinions

who presented a petition against it to the House of Commons.[137] The House delegated the examination of Montague's work "full fraught with dangerous Opinions of Arminius, quite contrary to the Articles established, in Five several Points"[138] to Archbishop Abbot. Abbot's dealings with it are unclear. According to his own report, he read the work and requested James's permission to send for Montague to speak with him concerning it. James's permission granted, Abbot then wrote to Montague who replied with a letter expressing "a generall sorrowe that he should be thus questioned,"[139] but agreeing to a meeting with Abbot on the matter.

Abbot went again to the king, informed him of the exchange of letters, and told him "what course I did purpose to hold with him, which his Majestie very well

---

any longer upon the Church." They had Ward and Yates petition Commons against the work "to make their attack more regular and formidable..." Fuller, (The Church History..., VI, 16), writing from the opposite bias, described the complaint as follows: "Now two divines of Norwich diocess, Mr. Yeates and Mr. Ward, informed against him for dangerous errors of Arminianism and Popery, deserting our cause instead of defending it." Gardiner (The History of England..., V, 353) merely makes note of the complaint without comment.

[137] The petition was originally presented to the Committee on Religion headed by Pym who then presented it to the House on May 12, 1624. See Journals of the House of Commons..., I, 788.

[138] Journals of the House of Commons..., I, 788.

[139] S.R. Gardiner (ed.), Debates in the House of Commons in 1625 (London, 1873), p. 34.

approv'd." At the meeting Abbot remonstrated Montague with the following:

> Mr. Mountague, you professe you hate popery, and noe waye incline to Arminianisme; you see what disturbance is growen in the Church and in the Parliament House by the booke by you lately put forth. Bee occasion of no scandall or offence, and therefore this is my advice unto you. Goe home, revieve over your booke, it maye bee divers things have slipped you which upon better advice you will reforme. If any thing be said too much, take it awaye; if any thinge be too little, add unto it; if any thinge be obscure, explaine it; but doe not wedd your self to your owne opinion, and remember wee must give an account of our ministrye unto Christ.

Abbot thought Montague had taken kindly to this fatherly advice, and was quite surprised, having heard no more of the matter, to be presented with a defense of the Gagg the following May.[140]

The main problem with Abbot's account is that the role attributed to James therein does not fit his subsequent behavior. As the King was dead when Abbot made his report, it would have been rather easy for Abbot to claim James's

---

[140] This was the report of Abbot to the House on July 1, 1625 (Gardiner, Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, pp. 34-35). In his History of England... Gardiner cites the report with one alteration. He says that James, not Abbot, suggested the meeting with Montague (V, 353-54). In their accounts Fuller and Collier make no mention of Abbot's role. Heylyn merely notes that Abbot and Montague both appealed to James (Historia-Quinquarticularis..., Part III, 108).

assent to and cooperation in the "scolding" of Montague.

In fact, James, when approached by the author of the Gagg, not only sympathized with his views, but granted him permission to write a defense of it.[141] In so doing James lent his support to one who would stimulate the very controversy that James had attempted to avoid throughout his reign. Moreover the theology adhered to by Montague was in direct opposition to James's own Calvinism; he expressed the very views that James had censured other men for expressing.

Various attempts have been made to account for this aberration in James's policy. Peter Heylyn and Jeremy Collier both attribute it to a genuine theological change on the part of James. Heylyn accounts for this change on the basis of the disappearance of the ultra-Calvinist influences of Abbot (who since the hunting accident at Bramshill Park in 1623 had limited access to James), and of James Montague (who died in 1619).[142] Collier merely states that "his majesty had now disentangled himself from some Calvinian prejudices, and had a better opinion than formerly of the Remonstrants' side of the controversy."[143]

---

[141]According to Montague, James's sympathy went so far that he said in regard to Montague's works: "If thou be a Papist, I am Papist" (Gardiner, Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 46).

[142]Heylyn, Cyprianus..., 120; Historia Quinquarticularis..., Part III, 108.

[143]Collier, VII, 442.

Collier also attributes James's support of Montague to his pleasure with Montague's first work in refutation of The History of Tithes. H.H. Willson, who has written the best biography of James, completely ignores the problem. He does not mention either Montague, his works, or James's attitude toward them. He involves himself in the problem only to refute any claim that in his late years James's theological views changed.

> It has been said that in the last years of his reign James grew more tolerant of Arminianism because it exalted the prerogative, but in truth there is no evidence that he altered his opinions.[144]

Since Willson did not see fit to include even a narrative account of James's relationship with Richard Montague, it is difficult to guess how he, in the light of the above statement, would interpret it.

There are several possible explanations for James's behavior that do not assume a change in his personal theology. First of all, it was the Parliament that sent Abbot to deal with Montague. Throughout his reign James had opposed Parliamentary attempts to involve themselves in James's handling of religion (particularly in regard to recusants). He was not now about to cooperate in an attack against one of his churchmen initiated by the House of Commons. Moreover, the Parliament in question was the same

---

[144]Willson, p. 400.

body that had dissolved the Spanish treaties and thwarted James's dream of reapproachment with Spain.

Another possible explanation has to do with the content of Montague's Gagg. Though refuting a Catholic claim, the work actually attempted to show that the Church of England was closer to Rome than the Catholics themselves appreciated. In stressing the points of agreement between England and Rome the work fit well into another of James's dreams - that of a peaceful reconciliation with the Roman Church.

It is even possible that the Gagg itself had little to do with James's support of Montague. By the summer of 1624 James was a broken man; his Spanish policy had failed, and his son and favorite (Buckingham) had replaced him in fact, if not in name, at the seat of power.[145] It is hard to imagine that in such a depressed state James would sit down to examine carefully the validity of the charges against Montague. It would not be Montague, "the popish Arminian" who appeared before James for aid; but Montague, the defender of the divine authority of the church and the monarchy - Montague, the refuter of Selden; not Montague, the defender of Arminius. In such a circumstance it is easy to picture the old king giving his churchman permission to write a defense of the Gagg.

---

[145] Ibid., pp. 443-44.

To his good fortune James never had to account for his authorization of that defense which was to be dedicated to him. He died before the work was printed deeding both the dedication and the problem of Montague's Arminianism to his son Charles.

C H A P T E R VI

RICHARD MONTAGUE: ARMINIAN ASSERTION AND CALVINIST REPLY

Between 1625 and 1629 the controversy over predestination theology centered upon Richard Montague and his two pamphlets asserting the non-Calvinistic character of the Church of England. Montague was neither an outstanding theologian, nor, for that matter, a highly placed churchman. But he was the first public proponent of the Arminian theology outside the walls of the Universities. With Montague's pamphlets the refutation of Calvinistic claims on the doctrine of the Church of England became a public and political affair.

The response to Montague came on two levels: a series of pamphlet replies to his works; and a condemnation of the churchman and his theology in the House of Commons. In the case of the latter, the purely theological questions were almost entirely ignored. The question of Montague's Arminianism was set in the context of the Calvinist fear of popery. But the real issue was the general orientation of the Church of England, an issue that could be settled only in terms of who was to control the Church of England - the Calvinists or the Laudians.

In the case of the former the theological and quasi-

political question involved in English Arminianism were combined. As will be seen, the early replies to Montague were almost entirely theological in character, but as the House of Commons increasingly became involved with the issue, the character of the pamphlets became more political. The question was no longer simply one of truth, but of treason.

Before examining the intellectual character of the theologically oriented pamphlets and the nature of the more political ones, it is necessary to turn first to the Arminian theology set forth in Montague's own pamphlets.

Richard Montague was prebendary of Windsor and rector of a parish in Essex when he wrote A Gagg for the New Gospel? No: A Gagg for the Old Goose.[1] In the preface Montague explained that the work was occasioned by the proselytizing efforts of some Catholics in his parish. When one of Montague's parishioners, who was the object of these efforts, had come to him with her doubts, he asked her to invite the papists to seek him out. When they failed to do so, he gave her a letter addressed to the proselytizers stating that he would himself convert to the Roman faith if

---

[1] Little is known of Montague's early life. He was a son of Laurence Montague, vicar of Dorney in Buckinghamshire. From Eton College he went on to King's College, Cambridge in 1594 where he was distinguished for his skill in classical and early ecclesiastical literature. He became James's chaplain, held the canonry at Windsor, a fellowship at Eton, and the rectory in Essex.

they could prove: that the Roman Catholic Church was the true Catholic Church, or even a member of that Church; that the present Church of England was not a member of the true Catholic Church; or that the points of difference between the Roman and English Churches were subscribed to up to five hundred years after the death of Christ.

At this time there was no direct reply to his challenge, but eighteen months later he did receive the pamphlet, A Gagge for the New Gospel: A Brief Abridgment of Errors of the Protestants of our Times[2] together with a note inviting him to publish an answer. He then wrote the treatise, A Gagg for the New Gospel? No: A Gagg for an Old Goose, gave it to the parishioner in question, but as far as he knew the papist never received the pamphlet.[3] The work was published in 1624 with a note on the title page stating "Published by Authoritie."

In this pamphlet Montague directed his attention to

---

[2]The author has been identified as Mathew Kellison (1560-1642), President of the English College at Douay.

[3]Arthur Kautz ("The Jacobean Episcopate and Its Legacy," p. 230) questions the innocence of motive that Montague attributes to himself. He feels that Montague's pamphlets were part of a planned effort on the part of the Arminian party to invite controversy at an opportune moment. The main problem with Kautz's thesis is that if Montague's treatise was a calculated attack on the Calvinists, it was poor calculation. The Duke of Buckingham was in alliance with the Puritans; the Parliament was certainly unsympathetic to the Arminian cause. Moreover James's position was clear. Why, after years of accommodating silence, would the Arminians now take such a chance on James's support?

denying the theological positions attributed to the Church of England by the Catholic Gagger (as Montague referred to the author of A Gagge, for the New Gospel...). Although most of Montague's work dealt with disputing the imputation of certain anti-Roman doctrines to the English Church, five of the chapters in his work were dedicated to refuting the Gagger's claim that the Church of England taught the Calvinistic theology of predestination.

Montague's first dealings with predestination were inadvertent. Arguing that the Church of England agreed with Rome that Saint Peter was the greatest of the Apostles, and differed with Rome only "about the extent and nature of his greatnesse,"[4] Montague cited Luke 22:3 to refute the claim that the Church of England taught that Peter's faith had failed: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." Although the Church taught that Peter's faith failed totally for a time, it would never teach, in contradiction to the above verse, that Peter's faith was lost eternally.

Thus far Montague was on shaky, but safe grounds within the context of Calvinistic theology; but he then added that the Lucan prayer applied to Peter alone.[5] The purpose of this addition was to exclude the Roman claim that prayers on Peter's behalf applied to all future occupants of the

---

[4]Richard Montague, A Gagg for the New Gospel? No: A New Gagg for An Old Goose (London, 1624), p. 60.

[5]Ibid., p. 64.

Roman see. It was, however, easy enough for the Calvinists to understand Montague's comments also as a denial of the Calvinist claim that the prayer applied to all the elect. In the 1595 controversy at Cambridge the Calvinists had cited the Lucan verse to Barret who had refused to acknowledge any claim for the doctrines of assurance and indefectibility on the basis of it.[6]

Montague turned directly to the issue of predestination in his tenth chapter refuting the assertion that the Church of England taught that with the fall of Adam man had permanently lost his free will and his power to choose between good and evil. This, Montague claimed, was not the official teaching of the Church, but rather the private opinion of a few.[7] The whole question moreover, was one "of obscurity which better might have beene over-passed in silence, fitting rather Schooles, then popular eares..."[8]

According to Montague the Church of England taught that in the state of nature man had no free will for matters civil, moral, or pious. But through the preventing grace offered to all by the atonement of Christ, man, though still in a state of corruption, regained some freedom of will even in matters of piety, and "such as belong unto his salva-

---

[6] See Chapter II, p. 69-70.

[7] Montague, Gagg..., p. 109.

[8] Ibid., p. 107.

tion."[9] Although God's assisting and cooperating grace was necessary for man's salvation, "man is not passive in all workes of Grace, to glory: ...man is to worke, that will have reward."[10] With his free will augmented by God's assisting grace, man is able to earn his salvation.

> This is enough: And the wisdom of the Church hath not ventured farre, to put a tye of Obedience upon mens beliefe, in points of inextricable obscurity almost, of the concordance in working of Grace, and Predestination with Free-Will.[11]

Montague's interpretation of Article X ("Of Free Will") was essentially Arminian insofar as it assumed the universal application of Christ's atonement. Although he did not go so far as Arminius in relating free will and predestination to God's prescience, his interpretations of the position of the Church of England actually were in opposition to the Calvinistic doctrine.

On the question of indefectibility, unlike that of free will, Montague claimed that the Church of England had made no prescriptions. It permitted both the Calvinist and the Arminian interpretations so long as no one disturbed the peace of the Church, or attempted to impose his private judgment on others. But, although the Church did not take

---

[9] Ibid., p. 109.

[10] Ibid., p. 110.

[11] Ibid.

a stand against the Calvinist doctrine, many English churchmen "opposed and repelled" the Calvinist theology at home and abroad "as this fellow [the Gagger] cannot but know, if he know anything in these points."[12]

Thus far Montague did nothing more than reassert the moderate character of the theology of the English Church. From here he went on to defend the doctrine of defectibility citing numerous Scriptural passages in support of the possibility of total and final loss of grace and faith. He did not contend that his Church taught defectibility of grace, nor did he present his own "private opinion" on the matter. He claimed that he was merely examining the various private opinions and Scriptural sources concerning the issue; but it is clear that his personal preferences were the opposite of those preferred by the Calvinists.

His argument against the doctrine of indefectibility went as follows. The Angels were in a state of glory, yet Lucifer fell from Heaven eternally; Adam was in a state of innocence, yet he fell from Paradise totally. No man's state of grace was likely to be "of an higher alloy" than the glory of the angels or the innocence of Adam in Paradise. Yet Lucifer and Adam fell, the one eternally and the other totally, because they disobeyed God. Since "the most righteous man living upon the face of the earth, continually

---

[12] Ibid., p. 157.

doth or may in this sort transgresse,"[13] at times man also must fall totally and/or finally from grace. This, not the Calvinist doctrine, was the "private resolution of many, if not most Protestant Divines, as private men of Protestant Churches in their Decisions and Resolutions." In fact, "the Church of Geneva itselfe as I was told by one of the chief ministers thereof, doth not maintaine these private opinions of the principall Pastors of That Church."[14]

Montague's refutation of the Gagger's charge that the Church of England taught the Calvinistic doctrine of irrespective predestination followed a similar pattern. He first argued that the opinion that "Peter could not perish, though he would;" and Judas could not be saved, "do what he could," was only "the private fancy of some men."[15] The seventeenth article of the Thirty-nine did not prescribe or dogmatize the details of the mystery of predestination. It taught only the fact of predestination without "presuming to determine of When, How, Wherefore, or Whom..."[16]

Again Montague was not satisfied with refuting the attempt to Calvinize the teachings of the Church. As with the doctrine of indefectibility he presented citations and

---

[13] Ibid., p. 162

[14] Ibid., p. 171.

[15] Ibid., p. 179.

[16] Ibid.

arguments in support of the "Arminian" (though he never used the term) theology.

> God fore-saw it in Adam and in Judas: but Prescience inferreth not Predestination. For, not because foreseene, therefore effected; but because effected, therefore foreseene.
>
> God was Author of neyther /the salvation of Adam, or the damnation of Judas/ Positively.... That Good which they had, they had from God. This woe and unhappinesse came from themselves.17

Montague's approach to the question of assurance followed the position he had taken with respect to free will. This was not a point that the Church left either open (like indefectibility) or vague (like irrespective predestination). On this matter the Church never differed from St. Paul's words: "I pommel my body and subdue it, lest after preaching to others I myself should be castaway." (Cor. I (:27). With additional citations from Romans 11:20 and Phillipians 2:12,[18] Montague implied that in denying the Calvinistic doctrines of assurance and indefectibility, the Church of England, at least in spirit, was opposed to the most basic premises of Calvinistic predestination theology.[19]

> ...assurance most certaine in itselfe,

---

[17] Ibid., p. 183.

[18] Saravia had used this source in defense of Barret on the same point. See Chapter II, p. 68.

[19] Here he merely implied, while in the Appeale he stated the point clearly. See below p. 296.

> is contingent, uncertaine...because man is irresolute in his waies and unconstant in his works.
>
> ...who yet, in regard of his owne Infirmity and Inconstancy, cannot chuse but waver in his assurance and feare the worst, though he hope the best.[20]

The complaint of Samuel Ward and John Yates against Montague's work charged him with popery and Arminianism.[21] According to Heylyn the two terms were not yet intertwined in the Calvinists' minds. By popery Yates and Ward meant all points which "hold some correspondence and agreement with the Doctrines of the Church of Rome, or being not determined by this Church, are left at liberty for every man to please himelf in his own opinion, how near soever he may come to such compliance." By Arminian "they comprehend the Melancthonia Doctrine of Predestination, the Universal

---

[20] Montague, Gagg, pp. 185-86.

[21] Journals of the House of Commons, I, 788. See Chapter V, pp. 270-71. Previous to the complaint Ward and Yates were relatively unknown Puritan ministers in Ipswich. However this was not Yates's first pamphlet battle against the Arminians. In 1615 he had written a tract entitled God's Arraignment of Hypocrites With an Enlargement Concerning God's Decree in Ordering Sinne as Likewise a Defense of M. Calvine against Bellarmine and of M. Perkins Against Arminius, and in 1622 he published A Modell of Divinitie Catechistically Composed, Wherein Is Delivered the Matter and Methode of Religion According to the Creed, Ten Commandments, Lord's Prayer and the Sacraments, another attack on Arminius. In the earlier work he charged Arminius and his defenders with detracing "from the Maiestie of God" (p. 91) and "blaspheming against God's omnipotence" (p. 92). With Perkins he argued that neither good nor evil could be irrespective of God's will and wisdom (pp. 95-106).

Redemption of Mankind by the Death of Christ, the coopera-tion of the will of Man with the Grace of God, and the possibility of falling from Grace received."[22]

In Apello Caesarem, A Just Appeale from Two Unjust Informers,[23] his reply to the charges made by Yates and Ward, Montague sustained the distinction between his popish and Arminian statements. This work was divided into two parts, the first section defending his "Arminian" views, and the second, the points that the Calvinists had labelled popish.

The tone of the work was set in the preface with an aggressive attack on the Puritan Calvinists, and a forceful denial of the charges of popery and Arminianism. The Calvinists, not he, himself, he asserted, were attempting to

---

[22]Heylyn, Cyprianus..., p. 121. On this basis the sections of the Gagg that are relevant to this study are susceptible to both charges. In de-Calvinizing the doctrine of the English Church, and stressing the range of private opinion permitted therein, he was in Calvinistic terms, a papist. In the expression of his own opinion with which he concluded his discussion of each point, he was Arminian.

[23]This work was authorized by James who before his death ordered Francis White, dean of Carlisle to approve it. The approbation was as follows: "I, Francis White, Doctor of Divinity, and Dean of Carlisle, by the speciall direction and commandment of His most excellent Majestie, have diligently perused and read over this Book, intituled APPELLO CAESAREM, A Just Appeale from Two Unjust Informers; by Richard Montague, and finding nothin therein, but what is agreeable to the Publick Faith, Doctrine and Discipline established in the Church of England, I doe approve it as fit to be printed. Dat. 15 February 162⅓. (o.s.) Francis White."

create controversy so that their private theology might be taken as the "common and publicke Doctrine of the Church." They set "upon Us and our Church, like Bastards upon the Parish where they were borne, or Vagabonds on the Towne where they last dwelt, or were suffered to passe without due correction."[24] He, on the other hand, merely wished to preserve the integrity of the teachings of his Church by frustrating the Calvinist efforts. For this he had been libelled a papist and an Arminian, "though the world and themselves know, I flatly defied and opposed the One; and God in Heaven knoweth that I never so much as yet read word in the other."[25] The Puritans charged Montague with doctrinal error, when in fact, he argued, his views were contrary only to their own, not to the official teachings of the Church. They charged him with Arminianism when in fact he was no disciple of the Dutchman. Indeed, if his views were the same as those of Arminius, it was because they both turned to the early church fathers rather than to Calvin.

The first chapter continued this theme by way of an attack upon the integrity of Yates and Ward, "two Ganders" of the Puritan faction whose "self-conceit, and Presumption, will square Law and Gospel according unto that untoward Lesbian rule of their owne Private Spirit, and special

---

[24]Montague, Appeale, p. A2.

[25]Ibid., p. A3.

opinion..."[26] They had misunderstood, if not misrepresented his words; they had cast doubt upon the integrity of the authorities who had approved his work; their aim was not the peace of, but the Calvinization of the Church to suit their private opinions.

> ...what difference betwixt their Dictates and Papal Decisions? An abortive Embryo of the much groned-for Monarchie of our Puritanicall Parochiall, would-be Popes over Kings and Kaefars, and All that are called Gods.[27]
>
> I disclaime, as incompetent, Popular Cantonings of dismembered Scripture, and Private Interpretations of enforced Scripture. I will not bee put over unto Classicall decisions, nor that Idoll of some mens Reformation, unto any Propheticall determinations in private Conventicles after Lectures.[28]

As for the Arminian charge, Montague claimed that throughout the Gagg he had suspended his own opinions "out of due respect unto Peace and Quietnesse in the Church..."[29] and had merely narrated other men's opinions. Moreover, if by coincidence Montague's own views did agree with those of Arminius, he was in no need of any label other than Christian. His accusers, on the other hand, "delight, it

---

[26] Ibid., p. 3.

[27] Ibid., p. 7.

[28] Ibid., p. 8.

[29] Ibid., p. 5.

seemeth, to bee called after mens names for anon they sticke not to call themselves Calvinists."[30] They should have one man's opinions tyrannize not only their own beliefs, but the whole doctrine of the Church of England, "a Church every way so transcendent unto that of Leyden and Geneva..."[31]

With the second chapter Montague began in earnest the defense of his Gagg. The objections to his comments on the fectibility of Peter's faith were motivated by "pure malice and indiscreet zeale,"[32] for the context of his comments made it clear that he had not been considering the question of final perseverance, but rather the position of St. Peter among the Apostles. The question of final perseverance had arisen inadvertently, and he had not "delivered," but merely "supposed, related, and no more"[33] a non-Calvinistic view on the subject. Moreover, the position that he had set forth was not that of Arminius (as was charged). Although he had never read Arminius's writings (a point that he continually stressed), he had been assured that Arminius like the Lutherans in Germany taught that faith could be lost not only for a time, but forever. He, on the other hand, had spoken in this particular context only of a

---

[30] Ibid., p. 10

[31] Ibid., pp. 11, 12.

[32] Ibid., p. 17.

[33] Ibid., p. 15.

temporary and total, not of a final loss of faith.

In the two subsequent chapters he denied that he had advocated a particular doctrine in regard to perseverance. In their charge against him Yates and Ward had "patched up shreds cut out from several parts" of the Gagg in order to make it appear that he had in fact determined the question.

> I demand, can you finde any assent of mine annexed? I DETERMINE nothing in the question POSITIVELY.
>
> You have laid together into one Cento things broken and dismembered like ABSYRTUS'S limbs...[34]

After asserting the innocence of the Gagg, Montague proceeded to argue that if there were to be any resolution of the question of indefectibility in accordance with the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, it would have to be in favor of the possibility of total falling away from grace. The wording of Article XVI implied the possibility of a total fall, and the Homily, "Of Falling Away from God," which was written in Edward's time and approved in Elizabeth's and again during James's reign, "doth thoroughly and wholly insist upon the Affirmation, That Faith once had may againe be Lost."[35] In addition the Catechism taught that "many so baptized children, when they come to age, by wicked and Leud life do fall away from God,

---

[34] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

[35] Ibid., p. 32.

and from that state of GRACE and SALVATION, wherein hee had set them, to a worse STATE; wherein they shall never be saved."[36] Despite the claims of Yates and Ward to the contrary, the Calvinist leaders themselves had recognized that the doctrine of the Church favored the doctrine of the defectibility of grace. The Calvinists had objected to it at the Hampton Court Conference, and had attempted to have the wording of the Articles altered in favor of their own teaching. In spite of their efforts, the possibility of total fall was reaffirmed at that conference, and the "new Predestination" was styled "a desperate doctrine..."[37]

The bulk of the Arminian half of the Appeale[38] was devoted, appropriately, to the Calvinistic doctrines of irrespective predestination and reprobation. Here, as in the rest of the work, Montague first refuted the Arminian charge laid against him, following the refutation with a defense of the very theology he had just denied having advocated in the Gagg.

The petition of Yates and Ward had charged that "the whole xxi chapter of his book savoreth strongly of Arminianisme: wherein depraving and odiously reporting the Doctrine of Our Divines commonly called CALVINISTS, and declaring

---

[36] Ibid., pp. 34-35.

[37] Ibid., pp. 31-36.

[38] Ibid., Chapters 5 through 8.

himselfe to consent with the LUTHERANS..." Montague insisted that he had described the Lutheran position, but had not expressed his own consent thereunto. But with a familiar twist, he noted that even if he had shown a preference for the opinions of Luther over those of the Genevan reformer whom the Puritans so revered, who was to say that in so doing, he had erred against the English Church.

> John Calvin came after in time, and was but a Secondary unto Martin Luther; entering in upon his Labours and Reversions: and why should he challenge any privileged of preferment above MARTIN LUTHER, that I may not as well and lawfully declare my self for the one, as for the other? In this Church and Kingdome, doth any Rule, Cannon, Law or Authority, tie or command me to reverence the one above the other? to follow the one rather than the other?[39]

As offensive as such a comparison of the two Reformers might be to the Calvinists, Montague recognized that the real charge against him was not favoritism toward Luther, but rather the correspondence between the theology he seemed to favor and the heretical teachings of James Arminius. The Calvinists had stressed the Arminian rather than the Lutheran nature of Montague's "heresy" because they knew that in England Arminius's opinions were considered the dangerous ones.[40]

---

[39] Ibid., p. 46.

[40] Ibid., p. 39.

Up to this point in the Appeale Montague had made a point of denying any relationship between his opinions and the teachings of Arminius. Now, and only at this point, did he attempt to defend his opinions without disassociating them from the doctrines of the Dutch theologian. The English attitude toward Arminius's teachings was based upon James's preoccupation with the dangers of theological controversy and his fear that England might become infected with the Arminian problem with all its schismatic implications. Narrowed by his Scottish experience, James identified Arminius's theology rather than the entire political and religious structure of the Netherlandish federation, as the source of the Dutch problem. Not so limited as his former patron, Montague recognized that outside of its Dutch context, Arminius's theology was not dangerous per se.

> Surely those very points being Scholasticall speculation meerly, and as farre from State-businesses, as Theorie is from Practice, are not of themselves aptae natae to breed dangers. Those so dangerous opinions in the Netherlands, have beene as freely quarreled and as fiercely pursued in the Upperlands, of as long time, without all danger but of Tonguetryall. And why should they be so dangerous here?[41]

If anything, in terms of political theory, the English Arminians were a stabilizing rather than a schismatical

---

[41] Ibid., p. 42.

force. It was the anarchical, separatist Puritan, not the Arminian, who would ferment controversy in the English Church, and undermine the State in order to promote a private theology.[42]

Montague's defense of Arminius was short-lived. From this sound analysis of the "Arminian problem" he moved on to a clever attack upon the Calvinists. The attack was posed in the form of a reply to the charge that he attacked Calvin's teachings on predestination. He admitted that he had described the Calvinistic doctrine, but only in terms which were confessed by the Calvinists themselves, i.e., "That Peter could not perish; Judas could not but perish."[43] Arguing that he had not touched on the question of whether "this be good Catholick doctrine," he proceeded by way of denial to describe the worst implications of the Calvinistic doctrine.

> I did not charge you with making God the AUTHOR OF SINS; nor that God, who calleth himselfe, as he is, the Father of Mercies, made the greatest part of mankinde with intent and purpose, to PERISH eternally; to DAMME them for ever into and in Hell fire. That every man is, as he is Predestinate, a Sinner or Believer, NECESSARILY, unavoidably. That the Reprobate are incited on and provoked to sinne by God. That God was the Author of JUDAS treason, and the like. None of these dropped out of

---

[42] Ibid., pp. 44-45.

[43] Ibid., p. 54.

my pen against you...[44]

He then admitted that he had stated in the Gagg that the Lutherans abhored Calvin's doctrine, and that the Church of England did not teach it in spite of the Calvinist effort to make the world believe that Calvin was "the father and founder of our Faith; as if our Beliefe were to be pinned upon his sleeve, and absolutely to be taught after his Institutions..."[45] The fact was that although the Church of England did not presume upon men's consciences by specifically denying Calvinistic predestination, it "hath directly and in EXPRESSE words overthrown the ground thereof, in teaching thus: that a justified man, and therefore Predestinate in your doctrine, may Fall away from God, and therefore become not the Child of God."[46]

In the Gagg he had set forth only the anti-Calvinist character of the Church's position. He had attempted, he claimed, to restrain himself from setting forth his personal theology. Now that he had been charged for "Dangerous Doctrine therein" he could defend himself only by expressing his own opinion on the disputed points of predestination theology.

Man, not God, was the author of Adam's fall. God had

---

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid., p. 59.

[46] Ibid.

created man as good, but with free will. In using that freedom of will, Adam lost his freedom casting himself and his posterity into "one bottomlesse pit of perdition, and masse of damnation."[47] Then, God, looking at all men, had mercy on them and sent out Christ as his mediator to save them "that took hold of mercy, leaving them there that would none of him."[48] Far from being the author of sin and death, God was the author of life and salvation. Whether man was to take hold on the proferred life and salvation was a matter of his own free will.

If this be Arminianisme, stated Montague, "I must professe it."[49] If it be contrary to the findings of the Synod of Dort, there was no authority "whereby the Church in generall, or any man in particular" was bound to any of the conclusions of that Synod "farther than they agree with the AUTHORISED Doctrine of the Church of England..."[50] And as for agreement between Montague's theological opinion and the Lambeth Articles, those Articles had been "prohibited to be enjoyned, and tendred, or maintained as the Authenticall Doctrine of our Church, by supreme Authority..."[51]

---

[47] Ibid., p. 63.

[48] Ibid., p. 64.

[49] Ibid., p. 65.

[50] Ibid., p. 70.

[51] Ibid., p. 71.

Having rejected the Calvinist doctrine of election both in terms of the teachings of the Church of England, and of his personal leanings, Montague turned finally to the charges against his statements concerning free will. He began by reaffirming that the question of free will was an obscure one, discussion of which should be forbidden in public sermons and popular discourses.[52] Contrary to the claims of the Informers, he had pushed no popish doctrine in the Gagg. The theological differences over free will existed not so much between Protestants and Catholics as within each camp. Even on the greatly controverted point of the cooperation of the will in first moment of conversion, "many learned men claim they [the Protestants and Catholics] do not differ."[53]

The moderates of both the Roman and the Reformed Churches agreed that in the state of corruption man's free will, a natural faculty, was the sole cause of sin. And in the state of justification, the same natural faculty was endowed with grace, and brought forth works of righteousness.

> In both these states the WILL is as TRUE efficient; but differently: a PRINCIPALL Efficient in the first state; a SUBORDINATE efficient in the second; because the holy Ghost activateth and enableth it.[54]

---

[52] Ibid., pp. 75, 78-79.

[53] Ibid., p. 84.

[54] Ibid., p. 94.

This moderate position was expressed both by the Church of England and by the Council of Trent.[55] Neither denied man's freedom of will or circumscribed God's royal prerogative.

Appropriately, Montague ended the Arminian section of his Appeale with a final stab at the Synod of Dort. James's approbation of that Synod provided the Puritans with a rule by which they could and would insist that the Church of England supported the Calvinist theology. Although he avoided any discussion of James's part in the Dutch Synod, Montague repeated his earlier denial of the authority of the Synod over Englishmen. Indeed it "condemneth upon the Bye even the disciplin of the Church of England..."[56] And as much as the English Calvinists publicly revered that Synod, even they did not accept as binding all the resolutions made there, e.g., the cooperation of free will and grace; and negative rather than positive reprobation.[57] The decrees of the Synod of Dort were not binding on them, and were not binding on any Englishman who chose not to be so bound. As for Montague, he did not so choose.

> ...as I said, the Synod of Dort is not my Rule, and your Magisteriall Conclusions are No Rule.[58]

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 96-97.

[56] Ibid., p. 108.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

The Calvinist response to Montague's Appeale was immediate and prodigious. In the year 1626 alone at least eleven such responses were published. And in the following three years when the Montague affair was being debated in the House of Commons, at least six additional pamphlets were written concerning the issues raised in Montague's Appeale.[59]

The authors of these treatises included George Carleton, the former bishop-delegate to the Synod of Dort, who at the time of his reply to Montague was Bishop of Chichester; Daniel Featley, member of Magdallen College, Oxford,[60] student of the arch-Calvinist, John Prideaux,[61]

---

[59] I have limited the following discussion to ten of the 1626 treatises and six of the later treatises which are in the McAlpin Collection at Union Theological Seminary. The "missing" 1626 treatise is that of Mathew Sutclife, which according to James Bass Mullinger is entitled A Brief Censure Upon an Appeale to Caesar (The University of Cambridge, III, 58). A copy of the pamphlet is at Queen's College, Oxford, but the author is not identified.

[60] He was promoted to the provostship of Sutcliffe College at Chelsea a few years after he wrote his treatise against Montague "probably partly in recognition of his services in this memorable controversy" (Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, III, 51).

[61] In May 1625 Prideaux, in determining a theological disputation between one John Davenport and an Arminian of Lincoln College who had argued in part from Montague's Appeale, denounced Montague and urged his students "to be cautelous in reading the said book of Appello Caesarem and such like." See Anthony Wood, The History and Antiquities..., II, 354-55 and John Rushworth (ed.), Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in Law, Remarkable Proceedings... (London, 1659-1722), I, 177.

and chaplain to Archbishop Abbot; Francis Rous, former Oxonian, a relatively unknown lawyer and member of Parliament; William Prynne, a barrister who, starting with the Montague affair, made a career out of pamphleteering against Arminianism and popery; John Yates, the Norfolk Puritan who together with Samuel Ward had filed the original complaint against Montague's Gagg;[62] Anthony Wotton, a Cambridge Puritan who in earlier years had disputed with John Overall, eulogized William Whitaker and defended William Perkins; Henry Burton, another Cambridge divine and admirer of Perkins;[63] John Rhodes, an unknown minister at Emborne; and Matthew Sutcliffe, a Cambridge Calvinist who was seeking to establish a theological college to train clergymen... "especially to oppose and denounce the tenets of papists and Pelagianizing Arminians and others that draw towards popery and Babylonian slavery."[64]

George Carleton wrote two treatises in reply to Montague. The first and more extensive of these was An Examination of Those Things Wherein the Author of the Late

---

[62]See note 21.

[63]Burton was "clerk of the closet" to Prince Charles. When James died he was not retained in the post because he inveighed in a letter to Charles against the popish tendencies of Laud and Neile. Neile, who was the clerk of the closet to James, continued in the post under Charles. Burton became rector of St. Matthew's Church in London from which pulpit he attacked the Arminian and "popish" factions within the Church.

[64]Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, III, 50.

Appeale Holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrines of the Church of England (1626). Carleton opened his work with a short history of the predestination controversy tracing it from Barret and Baro to "Dutch" Thomson, to Montague. In direct contradiction to Montague, he declared not only that Whitgift and Juxon had "refuted their [Baro and Barret's] doctrine, and justified the contrary," but also that the Calvinist doctrine had been approved at the Hampton Court Conference.[65]

His major charge against Montague was that he maintained "the Doctrine of Pelagians, striving to make that to bee understood the Doctrine of our Church."[66] In support of this allegation he attempted to prove that the doctrines of Arminius and of Pelagius were identical. Montague had run "with the Arminians into the depth of Pelagius his poysoned doctrine." To Montague's claim that he had read nothing of Arminius and repudiated the Pelagians, Carleton answered:

> ...you say that you have read nothing of the Arminians...It seemeth that you are an excellent scholar, that can learne your lesson so perfectly without instructors.[67]

Theologically Carleton concentrated his rebuttal on

---

[65] George Carleton, An Examination of Those Things Wherein the Author of the Late Appeale Holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians To Be the Doctrines of the Church of England (London, 1626), p. 9.

[66] Ibid., p. 10.

[67] Ibid., pp. 19-20.

the issues of irrespective predestination and indefectibility of grace. Taking the sublapsarian position of predestination, he argued that the whole idea of election presupposed not "the masse of mankinde uncorrupt and innocent, but...the mass corrupted."[68] The elect were those chosen from that mass according to God's purpose; the reprobate were simply those left in the corrupt mass.

He had no argument with Montague's assertion that sin was the cause of reprobation. What he opposed was any effort to seek a cause for election other than God's will.

> There may be a cause of condemnation besides the onely will of God, but concurring with God's will; but of salvation no cause can be given but the onely will of God.[69]

Montague had fallen into Pelagian error because he attributed election to faith, obedience and/or repentance. These qualities may have some role in the ultimate salvation and glorification of the elect, but they played no part in the original "calling."[70]

As for perseverance and indefectibility, in his citations Montague confused the grace of predestination, and the "grace of Preaching" the latter of which could be

---

[68] Ibid., p. 15.

[69] Ibid., p. 40.

[70] Ibid., pp. 42-44.

lost totally and finally.[71] The grace of predestination, on the other hand, was to the end the gift of God.

> Touching those Saints that are predestinated to the Kingdom of God, such an helping grace is given to them, that perseverance is bestowed upon them, not onely that without it they cannot, but that with it, they cannot but persevere.[72]

The elect could and did sin - "it was not the purpose of God in calling us, to make us Angels, or to set us in such an estate wherein we should never sinne any more;"[73] - but they never fell into "presumptuous sinnes, that sinne that is unto death."[74]

The basis for Carleton's rebuttal of Montague's Gagg and Appeale lay not in Puritan zealotry. For Carleton the error of Montague (and of Arminius) lay not in a lack of reverence for the Genevan reformer, but in a lack of reverence for God's omnipotence. Montague's theology of predestination made man's free will, not God's will and eternal purpose the basis of predestination;[75] and his teachings on defectibility would make men "glory in themselves, in the power of their wills" rather than in God,

---

[71] Ibid., pp. 65-67.

[72] Ibid., p. 91.

[73] Ibid., p. 101.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Ibid., p. 47.

"who through many and manifold imperfections and infirmities of ours bringeth us by this grace unto the end."[76]

In his Examination... Carleton made only one reference to the Synod of Dort to which he had been a delegate. Referring to Montague, he wrote... "who with such height of disdaine sleighteth the diligence and industry of his brethren gathered at the Synode of Dort."[77] But in the same year - 1626 - together with four other former delegates to that Synod, Carleton signed a treatise defending the Synod against Montague's charges. The work was entitled A Joynt Attestation, Avowing that the Discipline of the Church of England Was Not Impeached By the Synode of Dort.[78]

The work was directed specifically to Montague's assertion that "the Synode of Dort in some points condemneth upon the Bye even the Discipline of the Church of England."[79] The treatise denied that the Dutch had been so wily "as to make preposterous use of their neighbors assistance, and to draw them in for concurrence, in matters of Discipline, with a forreine sister against their owne Mother."[80] Church

---

[76] Ibid., p. 101.

[77] Ibid., p. 46.

[78] The other signatories included John Davenant, Walter Balcanquall, Samuel Ward, and Thomas Goad.

[79] Montague, Appello..., p. 108.

[80] A Joynt Attestation Avowing That the Discipline of the Church of England Was Not Impeached By the Synode of Dort (London, 1626), p. 2.

discipline was not an issue at the Synod, for the Remonstrants as well as the contra-Remonstrants were advocates of ministerial parity.[81]

It was on the basis of the instructions from James that the English delegation chose not "to meddle with discipline there established."[82] On the one occasion when the subject was mentioned (in the writing of the resolutions), the English delegates did speak out against parity of ministers. That no formal protest in writing against the presbyterian church form was due only to the fact that no one at that Synod "once oped their mouths either in offence of our government, or defence of their owne..."[83]

Daniel Featley's tracts Parallelismus nov-antique Erroris Pelagiarminiani (A Parallel of the New-Old Pelagiarminian Error) and Pelagius Redivivus, or Pelagius Raked Out of the Ashes by Arminius and His Schollers (1626)[84] were attempts to substantiate the charge that Arminianism and Pelagianism involved the same theological errors. Featley paralleled the teachings of the Pelagians and the Arminians on original sin, the meaning of grace, the aid of

---

[81] Ibid., p. 5.

[82] Ibid., p. 8.

[83] Ibid., p. 13.

[84] Both were published anonymously, but have been traced to Featley, and are listed under his name in the McAlpin Catalogue.

grace in conversion, and the cause of predestination. He paralleled the "semipelagians or Massilians"[85] and the Arminian's doctrines of election based on foreseen faith, the uncertain number of elect, the universality of grace and calling; the freedom of will in conversion, perseverance, and their common objections to the Calvinist theology.

Consisting mainly of quotations in support of Featley's parallels, the two works set forth neither a coherent Calvinist theology, nor a straight attack on Montague's works. The latter was reserved for Featley's third tract published in the same year - A Second Parallel Together With a Writ of Error Sued Against the Appealer in which he attempted to show that Montague, despite his denials, was a disciple of Arminius whose "pedigree is lineally to be derived from Pelagius..."[86]

> ...the Appealer disclaims all kindred or affinitie with Arminius; nay he protesteth, he knoweth not the man; and if peradventure some Longinus or skilfull Genealogist may be able to disprove him, yet certainly the vulgar reader is not.[87]

Though he denied being a student of Arminian theology, Montague directly defended the Arminians; he cast "a blur

---

[85] Daniel Featley, Pelagius Redivivus or Pelagius Raked Out of the Ashes By Arminius and His Scholars (London, 1626), p. B2.

[86] Featley, A Second Parallel Together With a Writ of Error Sued Against the Appealer (London, 1626), Preface.

[87] Ibid.

upon the Synod of Dort that blasted them;" he disparaged the Articles of Lambeth; he apologized for a man "whom King James of blessed memory, upon just and religious considerations, proclaimeth to be an enemie of God."[88]

Featley devoted the body of the work to indicating the affinities between Montague and Arminius, and Montague and the doctrine of the Roman Church. Of the five controverted points, he concentrated on answering Montague's assertions and citations in regard to falling from grace. Against the Appealer he argued that the Thirty-nine Articles (particularly Article X) did not admit a total and final falling from grace; that Overall had ended his speech at Hampton Court with an affirmation of the Calvinist doctrine of indefectibility.[89]

Featley carefully avoided a full discussion of Overall's speeches at that Conference, for if Overall had affirmed the doctrine of indefectibility (as Featley asserted), he must have been attacking the Calvinist doctrine of assurance. And, whereas Carleton had himself rejected that doctrine and consequently could easily enough explain Overall's position at the Hampton Court Conference as an attack on assurance not indefectibility, Featley did not reject the doctrine of assurance and therefore could ascribe

---

[88] Ibid.

[89] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

no purpose to Overall's speaking out at the Conference.[90] In fact at the beginning of the Second Parallel Featley had attacked Montague for calling the Calvinist doctrine "desperate," a term that Montague had taken from Overall's presentation at Hampton Court.

> On the contrary, the doctrine of the Arminians and the Appealer, which maketh Gods Election to depend upon the will of man, which as they say may totally and finally fall away from grace, is in truth a most desperate doctrine, taking away all solid and firme ground of comfort both in life and death...91

Featley's own presentation of the doctrine of indefectibility was a traditional one. The Sacraments were merely a seal and did not confer grace. Thus that many of the baptized should fall from faith was no proof of defectibility.[92] True grace unlike baptismal grace could not be lost. The elect could and in fact did sin, but no sin of theirs was mortal. The seed of God's grace always remained and brought forth repentance and salvation.[93]

Francis Rous's Testis Veritatis, The Doctrine of King James also concentrated on defending the Calvinistic doc-

---

[90]Featley could have claimed, as had other Calvinists, that Overall had labeled "If I am saved, I am saved," a desperate doctrine, and as this was not the Calvinist doctrine, his remarks were not directed toward their theology.

[91]Featley, Second Parallel, p. 8.

[92]Ibid., p. 87.

[93]Ibid., p. 92.

trine of indefectibility. But his point of departure was not so much Montague's errors in regard to that doctrine as King James's affirmation of it. He reviewed James's Declaration against Vorstius, his condemnation of Bertius's work on defectibility, his approval of the Irish Articles, and his defense of the doctrine at Hampton Court.[94] Montague again was accused of misinterpreting Overall's remarks as well as those of James at Hampton Court. Overall was not attacking the Calvinist doctrine, but rather a doctrine that would separate repentance and justification. To the Calvinists the two were inseparable.

> Perseverance must needs have that sufficient Repentance without which it cannot be perseverance. And therefore the same Decree that decreeth Perseverance must needes also Decree that Repentance, without which Perseverance cannot be. And indeede one and the same Seede of God (Decreed to all the Elect) is an immortall seede, both of repentance and perseverance.[95]

At the end of his work Rous left off from his theological defense of indefectibility and turned to a political attack on the Arminians. Arminianism did not represent a school of theology, but "a kind of twilight and double faced thing that lookes to two Religions at once, Protestantisme and Popery..." The Arminians were not theologians,

---

[94]Francis Rous, Testis Veritatis, The Doctrine of King James Our Late Soveraigne of Famous Memory (London, 1626), pp. 29-30; 40-41.

[95]Ibid., pp. 54-55.

but politicians, factious men who would serve only their own ends.

> ...an Arminian is like a flying fish, if preferment be among the birds, he is ready to fly after it with the bird, and if it be among the fishes, then among the fishes he will swimme after it.[96]

Only in this context did Rous mention Montague by name - as "one that seemes to acknowledge such a thing [the preferment seeking character of Arminians] de facto."[97] Rous closed the treatise with yet another political charge: the Arminians wrought division in the country and the church by making advances toward Spain. Both this charge and the former one were expanded upon in later pamphlets against the Arminians.[98]

The fourth pamphlet attacking Montague on the point of indefectibility was that of William Prynne. Entitled The Perpetuitie of A Regenerate Mans Estate, it was the first of over one hundred and fifty pamphlets written by Prynne in defense of the Calvinist cause. The theological arguments set forth therein differ in no way from the traditional theological defenses of indefectibility. And though the work was heavily documented with citations and Scriptural references, Prynne was not at his best in this purely

---

[96] Ibid., p. 87.

[97] Ibid.

[98] See below pp. 322-24.

theological framework. The only insight it added to the controversy was its forthright admission that the Arminian doctrine of defectibility denied the very essence of the Calvinist system.[99]

The responses of John Yates (Ibis ad Caesarem, Or a Submissive Appearance before Caesar: in Answer to Mr. Mountague's Appeale, in the Points of Arminianisme and Popery, Maintained by Him...) and Anthony Wotton (A Dangerous Plot Discovered) were, unlike the preceding tracts, attempts to answer Montague's works in their entirety. They concentrated upon the core of the Calvinistic objections to the controverted works without isolating one particular doctrine.

Yates claimed to be responding only to the Appeale, but in the dedication of his work he attacked the theme basic to both of Montague's works.

> Your most Excellent Majestie cannot once be imagined to be ignorant of Arminius' doctrine; and of his wilie devices, who the better to give vent to his private distempers, afforded an universal toleration of opinion, so that the fundamentall truths of their publike Catechisme might be held unquestioned...[100]

---

[99]William Prynne, The Perpetuitie of A Regenerate Mans Estate (London, 1626), pp. 128-33.

[100]John Yates, Ibis ad Caesarem, Or a Submissive Appearance Before Caesar, in Answer to Mr. Mountagues Appeale, in the Points of Arminianisme and Popery, Maintained by Him... (London, 1626), Dedication.

In stressing the latitude of opinion permitted within the Church of England Montague had made it appear "that our church is uncertaine in her tenets, and dull-sighted in her owne doctrine...that we may wander (as you doe) up and downe, and yet keepe within the pale..."[101] His use of such terms as 'Calvinist,' 'Lutheran' and 'Arminian' was "factious and schismaticall,"[102] making it appear that the Church of England was a conglomeration of churchmen and church parties whose ultimate allegiance was pledged not to the Church of England, but to a particular reformer. Such was not the case. The doctrine called "Calvinistic" by Montague was the doctrine taught by the Church of England in the seventeenth of the Thirty-nine Articles, and affirmed on various occasions by King James.

At the Hampton Court Conference James had clearly warned that predestination theology should be handled carefully "lest God's omnipotence might bee called into question." He had issued that warning, Yates charged, "knowing full well that the doctrine of Arminius did plainly bend it selfe against that Attribute."[103] The true doctrine of predestination affirmed God's omnipotence by denying the freedom of man's will and the limitation of God's will by

---

[101] Ibid., p. 5.

[102] Ibid., p. 2.

[103] Ibid., p. 10.

prescience of man's use of his freedom which lay at the foundation of Arminius's teachings and which were affirmed by Montague.

> The Almighty hath in his owne power the will of men more than they themselves. Wee pray that we may doe Gods will, because the power must come from him, and where hee gives that power, no man resisteth.[104]

> Prescience, of anything in us to make way to God's election, is a wyre-drawne argument of evill consequence pulling things upon Gods will backward...Nothing in our freedome can overpower and master Gods will.[105]

The basic argument around which Yates concentrated his defense of Calvinistic doctrines of election, reprobation, limited atonement and indefectibility involved a time sequence within the Trinity which Yates called the "working out of our salvation."[106] This time sequence went as follows: the Father decrees whom he will have saved; the Son pays the purchase of redemption; and the Holy Ghost calls such as are chosen and redeemed.

According to this sequence, the faith upon which the workings of the Spirit depended must follow as the effect, not the cause of election. Yet Montague's Arminian doctrine of election would have the Father's will and work be a

---

[104] Ibid., pp. 25-26.

[105] Ibid., p. 16.

[106] Ibid., p. 37.

consequence of the Spirit.[107] In having God's election await the faith received through Christ, it would have "the Father begin his election after the Sonne hath performed his Acts..." Moreover, the Arminian assertion of defectibility negated the Spirit by claiming that man's will and action could overcome the force of God's Spirit.[108]

Yates amplified his "Trinity argument" with exegeses of the Thirty-nine Articles (in particular Article XVII), and with a thorough-going denial of free will.

According to Yates, Montague had misunderstood the terms "effectual" and "preventing" in respect to the moment of conversion.

> We doe what hee commands, but hee makes us to doe it. That is effectual grace. That is preventing grace which workes the effect in the will by changing of it, and making it will that, which naturally it opposeth.[109]

Just as the final end of man was determined by God, so were the means to that end. God determined man's fate and all the particulars that preceded and related to that fate.[110] By definition "none of God's elect can either miss of their end or neglect the meanes of salvation,"[111] and by the same

---

[107] Ibid., pp. 38-39.

[108] Ibid., p. 103.

[109] Ibid., p. 166.

[110] Ibid., p. 87.

[111] Ibid., p. 62.

definition, the reprobate can never believe or repent.

This, claimed Yates, was the doctrine taught in the Thirty-nine Articles and defended by James. Montague's arguments to the contrary were based upon distortions of the Hampton Court Conference,[112] misinterpretation of the Articles, and reliance upon such men as "Dutch" Thomson who had written a book on the same subject as Bertius (De Apostasia Sanctorum) whose work James had "cast away in an holy indignation upon the very reading of the title."[113]

But Yates did not leave Montague simply with an imputation of error. He closed his work with another version of the charge that the Arminians represented by Montague were attempting to breed discord and divisiveness within the Protestant camp. At the Synod of Dort which Montague so disliked, James had tried to establish in the Netherlands that religion which the Reformed Churches of Great Britain, France and Germany embraced. He had "looked not upon our dissonance in ceremonies, but upon our consonance in faith, and made that peace betwixt both, which M. Montague seekes to dissolve."[114]

Anthony Wotton's A Dangerous Plot Discovered was the most conservative (theologically speaking) of the answers to Montague's Gagg and Appeale. He set out to show that

---

[112] Ibid., p. 65.

[113] Ibid., p. 66

[114] Ibid., p. 168.

Montague's views on justification and defectibility came "not short one word; so that it seemeth little better, then a transcription out of the Romish faith, and opinion, taught amongst them;"[115] that his views on free will, in particular his notion that with preventing grace man can resist the Holy Ghost, far exceeded "the limits of the Councell of Trent...which sheweth his consent with Arminius in those grosse points which the Church of Rome durst not Patronize;"[116] and finally the discordance between Montague's views on predestination and the doctrine taught by the Church of England.[117]

On the last point Wotton asserted that the Church of England taught the supralapsarian doctrine of predestination,[118] and he took Montague to task for not presenting his case against that doctrine.

> It is a safe war, where there is no enemy; and a cowardly attempter, that refuseth the field where the enemie abideth.[119]

---

[115]Anthony Wotton, A Dangerous Plot Discovered (London, 1626), Part I, p. 55. The pagination of the work is as follows: 1 - 84 and then begins with 1 again.

[116]Ibid., Part I, p. 83.

[117]He claimed that these views were not even those of the Roman Church for "the Counsell of Trent hath decreed nothing touching the nature of Predestination; and the most common opinion of their Schooles dissenteth not from the Church of England." (Part II, p. 127).

[118]Ibid., Part II, 137.

[119]Ibid., Part II, 153.

Wotton also went further than any of the other Calvinist controversialists in presenting the English Church as in complete agreement with Calvin.

> ...all the world knowes that the Church of England doth agree with Calvin, in very many things, and it must doe so, or else it must agree with the Church of Rome, in all the points which Calvin rejecteth, which are all the decrees of the Councell of Trent, a very few excepted. If I should say all the Articles and Homilies agree with Calvin, for the maine matters of faith, I should say no more than what might be proved.[120]

Wotton made no effort to prove his claim. The purpose of this work was merely to show the correspondence between Montague's works and Roman doctrine, and the absence of such correspondence between Montague's views and the teachings of the Church of England. And although Wotton disparaged the task ("Ducklings, not Eagles, catch flyes"[121]), he took Montague seriously enough to cite him as worthy of damnation for bringing his popery and heresie into the English Church.[122]

The last of the 1626 replies to Montague[123] combined theological with more general charges against the English

---

[120] Ibid., Part II, 144.

[121] Ibid.

[122] Ibid., Part II, 156, 187.

[123] See note 59.

Arminians. Henry Burton's Plea to an Appeale: Traversed Dialogue Wise was written in the form of a dialogue between a Roman Catholic, an Arminian, and a Calvinist (i.e., in Burton's terms a "good" English churchman). The major themes running through the dialogue were summarized in the dedication and require only a few illustrative quotations from the text. The treatise had been written (1) to clear the doctrines of truth from the "infamous terme of Puritanisme;" (2) to salvage God's glory from the "sandy ground of Mans free-will" and "the haire of humaine mutability...;"[124] (3) to sanctify the "sacred ashes" of James whose honour had been "polluted, prophaned in high degree by the depressing of the Synod of Dort and exaltation of Arminianism which his Sacred Majestie so much detested;"[125] (4) for the sake of God's Church which was offended by the fact of an appeal to Caesar in matters of theology;[126] (5) for the sake of the

---

[124] The major portion of the text consists of Orthodoxus, the Calvinist, presenting the sublapsarian doctrine of predestination and a defense of indefectibility.

[125] Henry Burton, Plea to an Appeale: Traversed Dialogue Wise (London, 1626), 89. In the text Orthodoxus says, "...can the Appealer tax the incomparable judgment of that famous King of ignorance either in the choice of that representative Church of England, or in the State of Doctrines of it? Farre be it."

[126] Ibid., p. 10. "And for matters of Faith, our Caesar knows they ought to be pleaded onely at God's barre, and tryed at the Common Law of the holy Land, the Scriptures." "...to appeale to Caesar, gives (to speak plainly) a strong suspicion of the weaknesse at least of the cause. For so did Heretickes in times past."

ghosts of such forefathers as Bancroft and Overall who complain of the distortions of their speeches at Hampton Court; (6) for the communion of saints persecuted and reproached with the odious name of Puritan.

Burton also presented a portrait of the typical Arminian churchman. In the text this became a description of Francis White who had approved Montague's Appeale for publication.[127]

> ...he is no lesse ambitious of headship over men, then his Religion is of copartnership (at least) with God, in His glory. Secondly, as his Religion flatters him so he men; very officious in soothlesse soothings, the Spaniels, that finde his ambition game.[128]

The 1626 responses to Montague's treatises are unusually similar in content. First of all, without exception, each author attempted to answer Montague's objections to the doctrine of indefectibility. Four of the pamphlets were dedicated almost exclusively to that effort. The paradox, of course, is that this was the doctrine on which Arminius did not take a definite stand, on which he noted the possibility of proving either side of the question. But if Arminius had been "indefinite," Montague had not been. He had claimed that the Church of England rejected this Calvinist doctrine, and in so doing it rejected the

---

[127] Ibid., p. 4.

[128] Ibid., Dedication.

core of the whole Calvinist system. This was the challenge that demanded Calvinist response.

In theology the pamphlets not only covered the range of the various Calvinist versions of indefectibility (the elect sinned, but their sins were not imputed to them; they sinned, but never lost the seed of their grace; they were incapable of sinning), but also touched the two extremes in terms of reprobation (Wotton's supralapsarianism and Carleton's negative reprobation). In spite of these variations all the pamphlets presented some version of the Calvinist claim that the Arminians detracted from or denied the omnipotence of God.

The other feature common to all the pamphlets was the tendency to use James as the main non-Scriptural "prop" for their theological assertions. James at Hampton Court, James replying to Vorstius, James blasting Bertius's work on defectibility, James's participation in the Synod of Dort - all these were cited as indications of the true doctrine of the Church of England as represented by the late monarch. But more important is what the pamphlets fail to mention about James - his courting of the Arminian churchmen, his wavering policy in regard to the Dutch problem, and, of course, his support of Montague.

The first of these was not only ignored, but twisted. Overall was transformed into a defender of Calvinism and the Hampton Court Conference was presented as a Calvinist

victory. The "villain" churchmen were not the favorites of James; they included only such men as Baro, Barret, Thomson and Montague.

No effort was made to cope with the second omission; and it is possible that the writers were ignorant of the shifts in James's policy. Dort became the great historical precedent, and the "proof" of James's position on the controverted questions.

Amazingly, the pamphlet writers made no effort to reconcile their James who supported Dort with the James who supported Montague. Either they chose to ignore the problem because they could not "solve" it, or they did not believe that James, and not simply his unwise advisers, had patronized Montague's Appeale.

The pamphlets written between 1627 and 1629 tended to move away from the detailed theological orientation that was typical of the 1626 responses. Instead they reflected the more general fears, suspicions, and complaints that were being rehearsed in the House of Commons during those years.

Henry Burton's Israel's Fast or a Meditation Upon the Seventh Chapter of Joshua (1628) combined a diatribe against the spread of "popish" errors with an objection to the political philosophy of the Arminians.

> They daily creepe into high favour in Court; they prevaile mightily by their plausible, insinuating,

> intoxicating flattery. They goe about...to make the King glad with their lyes. Their theames and Theorems are, that Kings are partakers of Gods owne Omnipotency, though this be a divine Attribute, incommunicable to any Creature.
>
> Nor doe they blush not onely to preach these things to the face of the Court, but dare also to publish in Print this their shame to the open view of the world...[129]

In the Epistle to his Babel no Bethel, That is the Church of Rome no true Visible Church of Christ (1629) Burton again united the Roman question with some asides concerning the "creeping gangrene or fretting Cancer" of Arminianism. In this work the complaint was against the prevalence of Arminian works while Calvinist defenses were refused license on the basis that they touched upon controversial points.

The "court favor" theme and the tendency to view Arminianism as a form of popery were combined with yet another charge against the Arminians in John Rhodes's poem The Spy Discovering the Danger of Arminian Heresie and Spanish Trecherie (1628).[130]

> And let that hand,
> Be ever mark'd with th' ignominions brand
> Of infamous sedition, whose appeale

---

[129] Henry Burton, Israels Fast, or A Meditation Upon the Seventh Chapter of Joshua (London, 1628), Epistle. The reference is to sermons preached in support of the forced loan by Robert Sibthorpe and Roger Maynwaring. See Chapter VII, pp.

[130] The pamphlet bears only the initials R.I. But the McAlpin Catalogue identified R.I. as John Rhodes.

For Spanish-English favour, not for zeale
To God or truth, did hither first transferre
The Belgian Heretick, to make us erre.

No sooner comes Arminius to untwine
The bond of concord, and to undermine
Religion, with condemn'd Pelagianisme
(To make way for the Pope) but factious Schisme
With sencelesse Atheisme, cold neutrality
Loose Epicurisme, and damned Policy
Are ready t'entertaine him: and declare
Themselves (perifidious wretches as they are)
For him, ag'ainst truth received.

How sone doe those that should firme Monntaines be,
For truth to build on, leane to popery;
Laude Romish lawes, and to disgrace endeavour,
In truth's profession, such as would persever.[131]

William Prynne wrote three pamphlets on the Arminian problem between 1627 and 1629. The first of these, A Brief Survey and Censure of Mr. Cozens his couzening Devotions (London, 1628) was an attack upon the theology and person of John Cosin, chaplain of Richard Neile, intimate of Montague, critic and editor of the Appeale.[132] The second, God No

---

[131]Rhodes's work is unpaginated. In the last stanza quoted the references are to George Mountain ("Monntaines"), Bishop of London, intimate of Laud, and firm supporter of Montague, and to Laud ("Laude").

[132]Letters between Montague and Cosin indicate the extent to which Cosin assisted in writing the Appeale. See The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham Together With other Papers Illustrative of His Life and Times ("The Surtees Society"; LII; London, 1869), pp. 43, 66 of text and p. xiii of the Introduction.

Imposter, Nor Deluder (1629) was a short defense of the doctrine of limited atonement, in reply to Arminian attacks that the Calvinist doctrine made God's promises in the Gospel lies and delusions. Prynne argued that God did not delude the reprobate; he never sought their repentance for he knew they were incapable of it. The Gospel was addressed to all men so that the elect, who knew not of their election, would not despair,[133] and so that the reprobate, though not converted, would keep from atheism, paganism and idolatry, and at least momentarily, would enjoy the company of the elect![134]

Prynne's third work, The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme (1629) was, in Prynne's words, an "anti-Arminian Index."[135] The work presented seven anti-Arminian orthodox tenets, defended them as the doctrine of the Church of England, and denied their opposites.

The work was dedicated to Parliament with the call to discover and suppress the "Hereticall and Grace-destroying Arminian novelties..." which were destroying the State as well as the Church.

The provocation of Gods heavy wrath

---

[133] William Prynne, God No Imposter, Nor Deluder (London, 1629), p. 16.

[134] Ibid., p. 13.

[135] William Prynne, The Church of Englands Old Antithesis To New Arminianisme (London, 1629), Dedication.

> and curse against us (who hath
> blasted all our publike Enterprises,
> since these Arminian Errous (sic?)
> have crept in among us.[136]

Insofar as the Arminian heresy was identical with Pelagianism, it had its origins in Britain. Now it was Parliament's duty to "at least eternally interre it in the soile that bare it; and make its ancient (now its second) wombe, its last, its endlesse Grave."[137]

The theological aspect of the treatise presented nothing new, and Prynne's defense was not comparable to the tracts written in 1626. But Prynne's historical analysis of the Arminian problem which he scattered throughout the work, is the most thorough presentation of the Calvinist version of the history of the English Arminian problem.

Starting with Barret and the Lambeth Articles, Prynne insisted that the Articles were "received with such an unanimous approbation of the whole Universitie; that those Arminian Tenents were forthwith abandoned and Baro forced to forsake his place."[138] Moreover, those Articles were praised by the two Archbishops and were well-received by Elizabeth![139] In James's reign they were mentioned at the Hampton Conference, but by no means were they rejected

---

[136] Ibid.

[137] Ibid.

[138] Ibid., pp. 12-13, 123.

[139] Ibid., p. 124.

there,[140] and they ultimately were incorporated into the Irish Articles.

> We may safely embrace them, as a full declaration of the professed and undoubted Doctrines of our Church.[141]

As for the Synod of Dort, Prynne, going further than any of the preceding controversialists, argued that the English representatives came "not onely as Private men, but as representative persons of the Church of England," and as such "subscribed the severall Articles and Conclusions there resolved."[142]

The orthodox could build their case on the Lambeth Articles, James's attack on the Dutch Arminians, the Synod of Dort, the Articles, Homilies, etc. and a tradition of revered divines such as Whitaker, George Carleton, and Samuel Ward. The Arminians, Prynne claimed, had no such supports. They had only the series of recantations by Barret, Baro, and Sympson at Cambridge; and Brookes, Montague and Jackson at Oxford.[143] Their defenders - Baro,

---

[140] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

[141] Ibid., p. 124.

[142] Ibid., p. 41.

[143] Prynne cites a case of a conviction of a young man named Brookes for preaching some Arminian Tenets in a sermon at Saint Maries. Wood (The History and Antiquities...) makes no mention of this incident. I have not been able to trace this Brookes.

Thomas Jackson (1579-1640), president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, had written a treatise entitled

Thomson, Montague and Jackson - were all "men branded and condemned in our Church."[144] Baro was but "an exortique Frenchman," a "spurious Frenchman," a "branded and illegal witnesse then, being at the very best a forraigner...;" Thomson was "but an Anglo-Belgicus, a dissolute, ebrious, and luxurious English-Dutchman;" Montague's testimony was "wavering, dubious and repugnant to it selfe;" and Jackson "transported beyond himselfe with metaphysicall Contemplations to his owne infamy, and his renowed Mother's shame..." had his work "blasted by a Parliament examination" not

---

Of the Divine Essence and Attributes (1628) which Burton had labeled "most Blasphemous Arminian Heresie." Jackson replied to Burton in a tract entitled Dr Jackson's Vindication of Himselfe Written About Twenty Years Agoe or A Serious Answer to Mr. Burtons Exception Taken Against a Passage in His Treatise of the Divine Essence and Attributes (in Thomas Jackson, An Exact Collection of the Works /London, 1654/). Burton had charged Jackson with asserting an objective goodness in man in a state of nature. Jackson denied having made such an assertion in his Vindication (pp. 3176-77). But he added more fuel to the fire by attacking the notion of an irresistible will on the basis that such a will would mean either "there is no moral evil under the Sunne, or...Gods will (which is the cause of Causes) is the only Cause of such evil" (p. 3182). He asserted that remission of sins must be antecedent to commission or else that commission is necessarie (again making God the cause of sin). And the only doctrine of election that did not make God the author of sin was one that limited the decree to rewarding "the wicked and ungodly, for their wicked works, according to the inflexible Rule of his immutable Justice;" and rewarding "the Penitent sinners not for their works, yet according to their works or qualifications" (p. 3184). Against the charge of Arminianism, Jackson wrote that if to maintain the above conclusions was Arminianism, he knew not "wherein the Arminians differ from the Orthodox and Ancient Church" (p. 3184).

[144] Prynne, The Church of England, pp. 131-33.

unlike the Parliamentary attack on Montague's work.[145]

Prynne's "history" of the Arminian controversy is indicative of the Calvinist dilemma. The actual history of the controversy over predestination, unlike the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, was not vague and susceptible to Calvinistic interpretation. Where the facts did not fit the Calvinist cause, as in the cases of Elizabeth's response to the Lambeth Articles, and the actual status of the English delegation to Dort, new "facts" had to be created. Where issues were complex and contradictory, as in the case of James's general policy in regard to the controversy, the facts favorable to the Calvinists had to be emphasized, and those unfavorable ignored.

But the tragedy of the pamphleteering was not so much the distortion of history as the loss of interest in the real intellectual and theological issues. The pamphlets of 1626 perhaps had overemphasized the doctrine of indefectibility, but this had been a major question in the debate since 1595. Moreover, as Montague so readily pointed out, the doctrine of indefectibility laid the groundwork for the whole Calvinist theological system.[146] The problem was not the one-sidedness of the earlier pamphlets, but the absence of genuine interest even with indefectibility in the later

---

[145] Ibid., pp. 132-33. The reference to Jackson's mother is to Oxford University.

[146] Montague, Appeale, p. 59. See above p. 296.

pamphlets. Theology was all but laid aside. General charges of political and religious treason, addiction to popish heresy, and ecclesiastical opportunism were substituted for an intellectual defense of orthodoxy. As a result the confrontation between a liberal theology of predestination and a theology of absolute divine omnipotence was postponed.

Montague did not make any direct response to the pamphlets. His letters to John Cosin between 1625 and 1629 indicate that the controversial churchman was in no condition to enter into pamphlet debate with the Calvinists. He was both physically and spiritually ill. His letters alternately expressed terror of the consequences of the Commons's investigation of his writings, anger at the lack of support given him by the Laudian church party, and hopes of obtaining a bishopric that might save him from further attack. Ultimately Montague did receive his bishopric, but by that time the whole issue of Arminianism had escalated beyond a personal attack upon one churchman to a general attack on the entire Laudian church.

C H A P T E R VII

ARMINIANISM AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS 1625-1629

The change in the character of the debate over Arminianism described in the previous chapter was a direct result of the introduction of the Arminian problem into the House of Commons. Between 1625 and 1629 the context of the debate gradually shifted from specific theological questions to the constitutional and political issues which eventually led to the Civil War. By 1629 English Arminianism had become a political issue into which were incorporated the major claims of the House of Commons, e.g., parliamentary control over church doctrine and administration; parliamentary rejection of royal church appointments; parliamentary authority to compel the dismissal of ministers and favorites.

Two factors affected the change in the nature of the controversy over Arminianism. First of all, the country gentlemen and lawyers who chiefly composed the House of Commons were little qualified to delve into the theological intricacies of the predestination controversy.[1] They regarded Arminianism only as "a peculiarly subtle, and

---

[1] Joseph R. Tanner, English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century, 1603-1689 (Cambridge, 1928), p. 52; and Gardiner, The History of England..., V, 355.

dangerous form of the Roman poison,"[2] an identification that Montague's works unfortunately reenforced.[3] Moreover, those parliamentarians who were not of particularly strong Calvinistic persuasion[4] felt it was justifiable to examine and censure Richard Montague's works on political grounds without religious repercussions.[5] Protestations of political relevance aside, in dealing with Montague the House of Commons involved itself with the prescription of religious doctrine.

The second factor in the politicization of the Arminian question was the character of the new monarch. Charles had little interest in theological controversy, and, unlike his father, affected no pretensions as a theologian-king. He was committed to men rather than to religious

---

[2]Tanner, p. 52.

[3]I refer here to the fact that Montague's views on predestination theology were presented in a work the general purpose of which was to indicate the areas of affinity between Rome and the Church of England in doctrine and ceremony.

[4]e.g., Edward Coke, John Selden (who was thought to be an agnostic), and Thomas Wentworth.

[5]Edward Coke made the following statement before the House of Commons in 1625: "We meddle with him, only for his contempt to this House: whereof we have Jurisdiction. We will not meddle ourselves alone with adjudging his Tenets, yet we may inform the Lords, where Bishops are, and they are to judge it" (Journals of the House of Commons 1547-1714 /London, 1803/, I, 809; and Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, ed. Samuel Rawson Gardiner /"Camden Society," Vol. VI New Series (London, 1872-73)/, p. 47).

ideologies. The most specific statements that can be made in regard to his personal theology are that he was anti-Puritan and that his religious sympathies "were entirely with those who resembled himself in their love of art, in their observance of ceremonial order..."[6] This was the only theological basis for Charles's support of Montague.[7]

More important than his lack of theological commitment was his lack of understanding of the seriousness of the House's concern with religion. His Catholic marriage had increased the insecurity of the Calvinists to the point where they genuinely feared a return to popery, if not directly, then by way of Arminianism. But Charles viewed the attack on Montague and the religious issue in general only in terms of an obstacle in the way of the real business of the House of Commons - providing adequate supply.

Recusancy had also been an issue in James's Parliaments. But never had there been real doubts as to the Protestant direction of the Church. Neither theology nor the monarchical preference for particular churchmen had become the

---

[6] Gardiner, The History of England..., V, 363. G.S. Wakefield (p. 255) claims that Charles inclined toward Arminianism. But the only evidence for this inclination is that Charles supported churchmen who shared his dislike of Puritanism, and his love of ceremonial order.

[7] One month after James's death, Laud, at Charles's request, had presented the new monarch with a list of the principle clergy which indicated by the symbols "O" (orthodox) and "P" (Puritan) those eligible and ineligible for promotion (Gardiner, The History of England..., V, 364). In his study of Laud, Trevor-Roper erroneously interprets the "O" as signifying Arminian (p. 65).

subject of debate by a secular body. With the Montague affair the way was laid open for Commons to set down, however politically, guide-lines for "true" doctrine, and subsequently, to sit in judgment of the orthodoxy of the monarch's churchmen.

The first mention of Montague in the Commons' debates during 1625 came fleetingly on June 25[8] in one of the speeches in support of a petition on recusancy. The reference was clearly to the popish (as opposed to Arminian) aspect of Montague's works,[9] and is of interest here only as an indication of the primary source of parliamentary interest in Montague.

On July first (after the petition on recusancy had been drawn up and two inadequate subsidies had been voted) the House turned in earnest to the subject of Montague. They began with the reading of Abbot's account of his attempted intervention with Montague in regard to the Gagg.[10] Abbot introduced his report with an expression of his initial reluctance to get involved with the Gagg,[11] and

---

[8]The 1625 session opened on June 18.

[9]Sir Thomas Fanshawe speaking of the increase of popery said of Montague: "By printinge bookes of mediation to reconcile us and the Papists, such as Mr. Mountague's where, of 47 questions he defendes but 7 or 8 to be matters in difference betwixt us and the Papists" (Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 26).

[10]See Chapter V, pp. 271-72.

[11]"I could not tell how every where it was tasted that

closed with a refusal to go beyond his jurisdiction with the Appeale.

> ...for this second booke it selfe I shall, God willinge, freely give my judgment of it when and where I shalbe orderly directed to it.[12]

Having failed to draw Abbot even unofficially into the coming fray, Commons referred the matter of Montague to a committee on religion headed by John Pym, an adherent of orthodox Calvinism, if not a Puritan.[13]

This committee presented its report to the House less than a week later. With a recommendation that the doctrinal offenses of the Gagg be examined at "some more seasonable tyme,"[14] the Committee laid the following charges against Montague's Appeale: the work was "to the dishonor of the Kinge that is dead;" it tended "to the disturbance of the Churche and State;" and it was offensive to the House "beinge against the jurisdiction and liberty of Parliament."[15]

---

the booke should be handled or questioned in the highe Court of Parliament. I had reason to foresee that it might be objected - By whose authority will my Lord of Canterbury censure this booke without the Convocation or without the Commission Ecclesiasticall?" (Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 34).

[12] Ibid., p. 35. Underlining mine.

[13] See S. Reed Brett, John Pym 1583-1643 (London, 1940), pp. 27, 28, 80.

[14] i.e., after a conference with the Lords. See note 5.

[15] Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 48.

Of the three charges the first dealt specifically with Montague's Arminianism.[16] Reviewing James's policy in regard to the predestination controversy in the Netherlands[17] with particular attention to his role in the Synod of Dort, the report indicated that Montague had set forth opinions corresponding to those held by the heretics condemned by James, had impugned the authority of the Synod of Dort, and had cast doubt upon the consent of the English delegation to the canons drawn up at that Synod.[18]

The acts attributed to James in the charge are historically correct, but the portrait of James was gravely distorted by the omission of the aspects of his policy which were unfavorable to the image of an orthodox Calvinist. No mention was made of the fluctuations in James's Dutch policy between 1604 and 1617; no notice was taken either of James's original reluctance to have the disputed points of

---

[16]Only the last point in this charge was unrelated to the question of Arminianism. Montague had written in his Appeale that he had never seen a persuasive argument proving the Pope to be Antichrist. The Committee was quick to point out that James had composed many excellent arguments to prove just that point.

[17]The report erroneously identified Vorstius as the author of Bertius's De Apostasia Sanctorum. See Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 48.

[18]Montague had insinuated that the consent of the English delegation was under protestation (Appeale, p. 71). The Committee claimed to have examined Balcanqual on the point, and he had assured them that the consent was given under oath and extended to all the canons except three concerning discipline (Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 48).

predestination theology set before a synod (as opposed to leaving it for debate in the schools), or of the dead king's instructions that the English delegation urge moderation on their Dutch brethren at Dort. With a single exception the controversial and contradictory aspects of James's dealings with predestination theology at home and abroad were ignored. The exception had to do with James's response to the Calvinists at the Hampton Court Conference. This conference posed a problem not because it was an historical reality (other such realities had been ignored and erased from James's "record"), but because Montague had made specific references to James's refusal to incorporate the Calvinist doctrine of indefectibility into the Thirty-nine Articles. Rather cleverly the Committee dealt with this aberration in the King's otherwise orthodox past by noting that James had authorized that the words "totally and finally" be incorporated into the thirty-eighth article (on defectibility of grace) when the Articles of Religion were sent to Ireland. The Hampton Court Conference was not specifically mentioned. But by implication this authorization indicated that James held that the Calvinist doctrine was "likewise conteyned in the sence and intention of the articles of Englande, but not so fully explaned."[19]

The absurdity of the general charge lay not so much

---

[19]Ibid., p. 48.

in the details presented and omitted, as in the charge itself. The Committee would censure Montague for dishonoring James in a work that, as Montague had reminded the House only on the previous day, had received James's own "speciall warrant."[20] Even more important, the Committee sought to base its attack on Montague on an appeal to the theological leanings of the dead king without bearing in mind that a like attack could be made upon those whose theology was not to the liking of the living king occupying the throne.[21]

The second charge - disturbance of the Church and State - involved Arminianism only indirectly. Montague, like the Dutch Arminians, was accused of creating religious strife and attempting to alienate the King from his subjects. He had labeled Yates, Ward, and some unnamed bishops "Puritans" - an offensive term that he did not clarify.[22] He had slighted the "great lights in this Church, Calvin, Beza, Perkins, Whitaker;"[23] he had shown insufficient re-

---

[20] Ibid., p. 46.

[21] See Gardiner, The History of England..., V, 361.

[22] Montague had used the term "Puritan" in the looser sense of Calvinist in doctrine. The Committee understood it in the more contemporary usage as "non-conformist." They charged that Montague had labeled Ward and Yates "Puritans," "yet these are men that subscribe and conforme" (Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 49).

[23] Ibid., p. 50.

spect for God's Holy Word;[24] and his work had given encouragement to the actual and potential papists within the kingdom.

Of the specified points under this charge only the reference to the encouragement of popery can be taken seriously.[25] The assertion that Montague was creating dissension by calling such good churchmen as Yates and Ward "Puritans" was only a poorly trumped-up version of the Abbot-Winwood portrait of Dutch Arminianism as subversive. Montague's meaning in regard to the term Puritan was perfectly clear in the Appeale. His reference was to theology and doctrine, not to ecclesiastical polity or to ritual conformity.[26] And the raising of a few of Montague's sneers at Puritan lecturing and preaching to the level of the charge - "laboringe to discountenance and disgrace God's Holy Word," - evidences only the poverty of the Committee's case.

---

[24]Specifically he had referred to the meditations after lectures as "propheticall determinations in conventicles after lectures" (Appeale, p. 8); he had expressed scorn for the Calvinist "pratinge, preaching, and lecturinge..." (Appeale, pp. 15, 231); and had made the following reference to Puritans: "Never a saint-seeminge, bible-bearinge hypocriticall Puritan in the packe, etc." (Appeale, p. 43).

[25]Peter Heylyn did not even consider that charge genuine. It was only a way to distract the King and the people while "the Puritan party in the meantime might gather strength without being noted or observed" (Cyprianus Anglicus..., p. 86).

[26]Montague, Appeale..., p. 111.

The real complaint against Montague - the basis of these charges - could not be stated: Montague was attempting to loosen the Calvinist hold on the Church of England. The doctrine that he attributed to the Church was not the Calvinist doctrine; the reformers and churchmen whom he glorified were not the Calvinist reformers; and Montague's Church of England standing midway between the extremes of Rome and Geneva was not that of the Calvinists. But the Calvinists could not state their case so straightforwardly. To broaden their appeal so as to include those who did not love Geneva but feared Rome, they based their case on the importance of a united religious front against the invidious onslaught of Roman lies. The theological world was divided into two camps: Rome and Geneva. Anything between them was by definition unreconciled strife, and an invitation for Roman advance. Thus Montague's version of the Elizabethan *via media* was conveniently twisted into the image of a half-way house on the road to Rome.[27]

The third charge - that Montague, knowing full well that a complaint had been filed against the *Gagg*, had gone

---

[27] S.R. Gardiner (*The History of England...*, V, 363) does not see Montague as an adherent of a *via media*, but as doctrinaire and as exclusive of other opinions as his opponents. In the face of Montague's admission in the *Gagg* and in the *Appeale* that on many points of theology the Church of England did not specify doctrinal positions, this judgment seems somewhat harsh.

ahead with having the Appeale printed - was amplified by the accusation that he had violated the privilege of Parliament by attacking Yates and Ward who were under parliamentary protection. The main problem with this charge was that James himself had authorized the printing of the Appeale (with its attack on Yates and Ward) when he had been informed by his Archbishop of Canterbury of the pending complaint against the Gagg. And this was the "king who is dead" that Montague was charged with dishonoring!

There was no debate on the report.[28] It was immediately ordered that Abbot be thanked for his part in the matter; that a sub-committee be appointed to examine the doctrinal offenses of Montague's books in order that a complaint might be sent to the Lords; and that Montague be committed to the sergeant-at-arms until the complaint with the Lords was settled.[29]

In the debate which followed, a minority of the House cast some doubt upon the authority by which Commons would presume to examine the doctrinal aspects of Montague's works. Some questioned the knowledge of the House in matters of religion; a few others led by a Mr. Diat went so far as to question the proposed action on the basis that

---

[28]Gardiner confuses the debate over the subsequent orders with a debate over the actual report. See The History of England..., V, 362.

[29]Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 51.

Montague's doctrine was a common and popular one that had not yet been condemned by the Church.[30] Even among those who favored examination of the doctrinal contents of Montague's works there was little agreement on the basis for such action. Some argued with Sir Edward Coke that the civil courts ought to care for the peace of the Church; others claimed that the action was taken for sedition, not for the propagation of false doctrine; and a third group argued that since the doctrine of the Church was clearly stated in the Articles of Religion, a non-theological body could judge if Montague had written anything contrary to that doctrine.[31]

Interestingly enough, one of those who held this last opinion pointed to the Cambridge censure of Barret as a precedent for the House's action.[32] This speaker further noted that Cambridge had become so infected that an attempt had been made to allow the study of Montague's books. Obviously he wished to stress the infectious nature of the books, but in so doing he reinforced the argument of those who held that the House was proceding to condemn a popular

---

[30] Ibid., p. 52. Other than Mr. Diat, the speakers are not identified.

[31] As the names of the bearers of these opinions are not given in the records of the debate, it is not possible to ascertain the theological and political character of each group.

[32] Barret is misidentified as Garret in the Debates (Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 52).

and common theology that had not been condemned by the Church.

The order to detain Montague also occasioned some debate. Sir Edwin Sandys, an opponent of the Crown, joined with one of the leaders of the court party, Sir Humphrey May, in protesting against the precedent being set by the arrest of Montague.[33] He had committed no offense in defending himself in a cause that had not yet been subjected to judgment; and his offense to the Archbishop of Canterbury did not pertain to the House insofar as Abbot had lay no charge against him.[34] Others, less concerned with civil liberties, argued against the detention because they feared it would prejudice their case against Montague with the Lords. In spite of the protests, Montague was detained, and the House turned to other business.

Montague's brave speech to the House on July 6[35] was deceptive, for at no time during these proceedings was he sure of the support he would get from the Establishment. As early as October of 1624 he had expressed doubts about Laud. On a previous occasion Montague had done a favor for Buckingham who had shown his gratitude by offering Montague

---

[33]Harold Hulme, The Life of Sir John Eliot 1592 to 1632: Struggle for Parliamentary Freedom (London, 1957), p. 27.

[34]Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 52.

[35]See ibid., p. 46.

any preferment he desired. Now (in October 1624 when he was preparing to answer Yates and Ward in the Appeale) Montague wanted Laud to use his "greate credit" to remind Buckingham of his promise.[36] When Laud failed to do so, Montague wrote to Cosin:

> I smell a ratt. But I hope to see him one day where he will both do and say for the Church.[37]

In 1625 Montague was in even greater need of a preferment.[38] This time he appealed directly to Buckingham, but again met with failure.[39]

Buckingham was in no position to help Montague in the summer of 1625. In the early 1620's the Duke had seen fit to come to political terms with the Puritans, and had used his influence to have the Puritan leader, John Preston, appointed chaplain to Charles. In 1625 this alliance, which was reflected in Buckingham's relationship with Preston, was still in effect.[40]

---

[36]Montague to John Cosin, Windsor, October 24, 1624; John Cosin, Correspondence ("Surtees Society," Vols. LII & LV [London, 1869-72]), Part i, p. 22.

[37]Montague to John Cosin, October 30, 1624; ibid., p. 24.

[38]Montague confided to Neile, Bishop of Durham, that his only hope of saving himself was to obtain a bishopric. Montague to Neile, Windsor, July 10, 1625; ibid., pp. 78-79.

[39]Ibid.

[40]The Puritan side of the alliance included in its membership such prominent political figures as Lord Saye, Sir Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, and Sir John Eliot. The

The aid that Montague sought came from an unexpected quarter. He did not receive his bishopric, but in July Charles informed the Solicitor-General of the House of Commons that Montague was his chaplain, and that he would deal with the affair himself.[41] Heath, the Solicitor, knowing full well that Montague's preference to the royal chaplaincy was but a recent thing, noted that Montague had not informed the House of his position, and the fact of it "was hardly knowen but to very few in the House."[42] Charles immediately assured Heath that if the members of the House had known that Montague was his chaplain, he was sure they would not have initiated proceedings against him. Now that they did know, he was confident that Montague would be released, and for his part he would see that the House received satisfaction in regard to the questioned books. When the Solicitor reminded Charles that the offense involved contempt for the House, the King merely smiled without further reply.[43]

Charles's intervention in the affair can be understood only in terms of his desire for more money than the two

---

relationship between Buckingham and Preston has been studied by Irvonwy Morgan, in Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain (London, 1957).

[41] Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 62.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid.

subsidies granted early in the session. He had relied upon Buckingham's alliance with the Puritans in the House as a means for obtaining adequate funds for his foreign policy. It is quite plausible that when that alliance did not bring forth its expected fruits, Charles decided to use the Montague affair to remind the Puritans that he could turn to the Laudian churchmen who would not stand in the way of the monarch raising money without consulting Parliament.[44]

Circumstances strongly suggest that the instigator behind Charles's attempt at subtle blackmail was Laud.[45] Up to this point Laud had not given his personal support to Montague. Most likely he was aware that a strong affirmation of confidence in Montague would precipitate an attack on the liberal church party. For the same reason, and

---

[44]Although Montague was not an intimate of Laud, he was known to be a member of the "Laudian party." For the sake of clarity I have referred to the anti-Puritan faction as "Arminian." Although the leading churchmen of the Laudian circle personally may have inclined toward that liberal theology, they neither preached, taught, nor publicly identified with the Arminian theology of predestination. See Chapter V, pp. 240-47. In this particular context their exaltation of the privilege of the monarch, not their theology, is the relevant issue. On this point see Chapter V, pp. 264-69 and Morgan, p. 140.

[45]Laud certainly was one of the first to know of the exchange between Charles and Heath. On July 9, 1625 he noted in his diary: "Saturday, it pleased his Majesty King Charles to intimate to the House of Commons, that what had been there said and resolved, without consulting him, in Montague's cause, was not pleasing to him" (Laud, III, 167). The King's intervention in the Montague case was reported to the House on the same day that Laud made this entry. Moreover it was Laud who first informed Montague of his appointment as chaplain. See ibid.

because he knew Charles's hopes for future financing still were fastened upon the Buckingham alliance with the Puritans, he could not approach Buckingham about the bishopric.[46] Laud was a practical and political churchman. Montague was not worth either the chance of wrecking Charles's hopes, or the possibility of a full scale attack on Laud's own clerical following and influence within the Church.

But, on the other hand, to permit the Commons to examine the doctrinal aspects of Montague's works would set an extremely dangerous precedent. Consequently Charles was drawn into the above attempt to take the whole affair out of the hands of the civil body. The pressure was slight, and it was discreetly applied. Unfortunately Charles was not aware how fragile his relationship with the present Parliament had become. His personal intervention was quite enough to escalate the whole question of Montague into an issue of ministerial responsibility.

On July 11 the Commons adjourned after formally rejecting Charles's request that Montague be released.[47]

---

[46]Morgan argues that Laud's failure to use his influence with Buckingham in this matter is an indication of the lack of influence Laud had with the Duke. He claims that Laud's real credit was with Charles (p. 155). But if this were the sole reason for Laud's failure to fulfill Montague's request, why then did Laud not use his "great credit" with Charles to obtain the same result?

[47]Charles's request for the release was made to the House on July 9. The House refused to release Montague, but

On August 1 the House was to reconvene at Oxford because of the plague then raging in London. In that short interval Charles had to decide how he would cope with Montague, as well as with the presumptions of the Commons that they could sit in judgment on the doctrines of the monarch's personal clergy.[48]

Realizing now that the established relationship between Church and State was at stake, three bishops, Laud, Buckeridge of Rochester, and Howson of Oxford wrote to Buckingham on behalf of Montague.[49] Arguing that the Church of England had been established as a moderate church which avoided prescription of detail and abstract theological points, they defended Montague's opinions as falling into the category of such unprescribed obscure points and/or as

---

granted that he might be let out on bond. This was not really a concession to Charles, for the possibility of bond had already been hinted at when the order was first given that he be taken into custody (Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 53).

[48]S.R. Gardiner calls this decision "even yet more momentous than that of the direction of the war" (The History of England..., V, 363).

[49]Morgan sees the letter as a response to the Puritan suggestion for a conference on the disputed points of predestination. The Arminians, he claims, did not want such a conference because they feared that the authorization of the Synod of Dort would result from it (p. 158). Although such a conference was held in February 1626, I have found no indication that it was suggested as early as August 1625. Moreover the purpose of the 1626 conference was to assure Buckingham's loyalty to the Puritan alliance. In August of 1625 there was no reason to doubt Buckingham's good faith.

the express doctrine of the Church of England.

Their chief concern, however, was not so much to defend Montague, as to protect the Church from the new claims of Parliament. From the time of Henry VII, they argued, doctrinal differences had been judged and settled by the king and bishops in a national synod or in Convocation. (Ironically, this same argument was presented by Dudley Carleton in defense of James's role in the calling of the Synod of Dort).[50] To permit otherwise, not only would go against the ordinance of Christ, but would result in the destruction of the Church. Moreover, and again the irony is obvious, if Parliament persisted in the attack on Montague's work, they would be dishonoring the dead king "who saw and approved all the opinions of this book; and he in his rare wisdom and judgment woud never have allowed them, if they had crossed with truth and the Church of England."[51]

Thus far the arguments of the bishops had stayed within the bounds of even the moderate Elizabethan tradition. If the Articles of Religion are interpreted as broadly as Elizabeth would have had them, Montague's opinions were in no way a contradiction of the doctrine taught therein. Certainly Elizabeth, and James as well, would have applauded

---

[50] See Chapter IV, p. 184.

[51] Laud, VI, 245.

the argument that the monarch and his bishops, not the Parliament, should decide questions of doctrine. But the real issue was not one of precedent, but of the changing relationship between monarch and Parliament.[52]

So long as the king was considered the representative of the state and nation, the claim that only he and his bishops could establish doctrine was valid. But if Parliament, rather than monarch, represented the nation, then the whole issue of historical precedent was irrelevant. At this time the situation was unclear for Parliament was just beginning to feel its way toward making such a claim. A civil war would be fought before the issue was decided.

As for the theological issue, only at the close of their letter did the three bishops reveal their Arminian as opposed to "moderate" sympathies. It was not only a question of unjust charges and an unwarranted assumption of responsibility by Parliament, but a matter of the Parliament fostering and pushing a doctrine on the Church that was false and impious.

> ...we must be bold to say, that we cannot conceive what use there can be of civil government in the commonwealth, or of preaching and external ministry in the church, if such fatal opinions as some which are opposite and contrary to those delivered by Mr. Montague, are and shall be publicly taught and

---

[52]Gardiner, The History of England..., V, 403.

maintained.[53]

From this first succinct statement of their anti-Calvinist position, they turned to an attack on the two major precedents upon which the Calvinists based their claim that the predestination theology of the Church of England was of the Genevan persuasion: the Lambeth Articles and the Synod of Dort. The Lambeth Articles which asserted "all or most of the contrary opinion"[54] had been condemned and suppressed by Elizabeth as contrary to "the practice of piety and obedience to all government..."[55] As for the Synod of Dort, it was the synod of a foreign nation and had no authority in the Church of England. Furthermore, that authority, in the opinion of the bishops, should never be granted.

> ...our hope is that the Church of England will be well advised, and more than once over, before she admit a foreign Synod, especially of such a Church as condemneth her disciplin and manner of government to say no more.[56]

The most striking aspect of the letter is that while the Commons emphasized the popish more than the Arminian aspects of Montague's works, the three bishops limited their

---

[53]Laud, VI, 245.

[54]Ibid., p. 246.

[55]Ibid.

[56]Ibid.

theological discussion to the problem of predestination theology. One plausible reason for this is that theologically the Arminian charge against Montague was most creditable. Although the Lambeth Articles had never been published as Church doctrine, neither they nor the propagators of them had been discredited by the Church. Equally if not more complex was the issue of the Synod of Dort. James had approved Montague's Gagg which would discredit the Synod, but at the same time, James had been one of the chief supporters of that same Synod. Unfortunately this confusing and contradictory royal policy in regard to the predestination controversy provided ample precedents for Puritan and anti-Puritan alike. The liberal bishops could only imitate the opposition by pointing to those precedents which would favor their own cause. The absence of any basis for a theological resolution of the controversy made some kind of political resolution necessary even if undesirable.

When the Commons reassembled at Oxford, they began the session by considering the "Catholic problem," and then turned once again to the business of Montague. This time the constitutional implications of the case were set forth clearly, and Charles's attempt to save Montague by declaring him his personal servant boomeranged into a parliamentary assertion of ministerial responsibility. Not just Montague, but all royal ministers were responsible to Parliament.

All Justices of Peace, all Deputy

> Lieutenants are the King's servants, and indeed no man can committ a publicke offence but by color and opportunity of publick imployment and service to the Kinge: so that, if wee admit this, wee shall take the way to destroye Parliaments...[57]

The speaker, Edward Alford, did not specify the extent of parliamentary involvement he would advocate in the Montague case, but Sir Edward Coke, who spoke out in support of the above argument, repeated his earlier assertion that the House was interested only in the contempt charge.[58] The question of doctrine they would transfer on to the House of Lords. But this position clearly was not shared by all the members of the Commons, for in the midst of the debate on ministerial responsibility, at least two speakers made direct reference to the theological content of Montague's books.

Sir Robert More discussed the issue of the fallibility of grace at length,[59] while yet another speaker made a general statement in support of a doctrinal investigation of the works.

> Arminianisme /is/ more dangerous then popery, because wee are more secure of it; it is hardlier to be distinguisht, and ther is no

---

[57] Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 70.

[58] Ibid.

[59] His specific remarks on the subject are not recorded in either The Debates in the House of Commons in 1625 or in the Journals of the House of Commons.

> law againste it, though it be not only contrary /to/ the articles of the Church of England, but of all other reformed Churches; for the Nationall Synode of Charenton was confirm'd by that of Dorte.[60]
>
> That this Book so dangerous to the Church and State cometh out cum Privilegio, which maketh it accounted the Doctrine of the Church of England -- and so the Opposers Schismatiques -- the Danger to the Low Countries by Arminianism.[61]

Although it was made clear that Charles's "intervention" in the Montague case was not to be tolerated by the Commons, the whole issue of Montague (both in terms of doctrine and the contempt charge) remained undecided in 1625. While Montague's failure to appear before the House[62] may account for the absence of further debate on the contempt charge, the absence of any report from or reference to the Pym committee until April 1626[63] can be understood only in terms of the events intervening between the adjournment of the 1625 session on August 12 and the appearance of that report in April.

Of the three leading figures in the Establishment in

---

[60] Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 71.

[61] This version of the speech appears in the Journals of the House of Commons, I, 810.

[62] He was too ill to make the required appearance when he was called. See the Journals of the House of Commons, I, 809, 812.

[63] The Parliament of 1626 opened on February 6.

1625 - Charles, Buckingham and Laud - only Laud had come out in direct support of Montague. In spite of his effort to take the case out of the House of Commons, Charles was by no moans ready to put his personal stamp of approval on Montague's theology. In fact on August 4, 1625, one of Charles's secretaries of state made the following statement in reviewing James's foreign policy before the House of Lords:

> In the Low Countries, the Sect of the Arminians prevailed much, who inclined to the Papists rather than their own Safety; not withstanding that the Enemy had a great and powerful Army there at that time.[64]

In spite of this hint that Charles might go along with Commons on the Arminian issue and his agreement to the enforcement of anti-Catholic legislation, the Commons of 1625 not only had refused him additional supply, but the radicals had gone so far as to attack Buckingham by name for the surrender of English ships to the French.[65] By the end of 1625 it must have been obvious to Charles that the Commons was not prepared to do any trading with him either on the supply or on the religious issue. In other words, Buckingham's alliance with the Puritan political leaders had not paid off.

---

[64] Journals of the House of Lords, II, 471. Rushworth notes that the speech was made "at the King's command" (I, 178).

[65] Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 118.

Buckingham's own position in regard to Montague does not seem to have been decided before the end of 1625. Although he may have been influenced by the Laud-Buckeridge-Howson letter of August 2, there was no outward indication of it, for during the 1625 session Buckingham had continued to keep faith with the Puritans.[66]

But by January of 1626 Buckingham, like his patron, had become disenchanted. Charles asked Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, to consult with "the bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, Oxford, and St. David's, or some of them" concerning Montague, and to report their judgment of the business to Buckingham.[67] This request was for nothing less than a testimonial in support of the controversial clergyman, for undoubtedly Charles was aware of the theological outlook of these bishops. In brief form the bishops declared Montague's assertions to be in agreement with the

---

[66] He had begged Charles not to dissolve Parliament; he had dismissed John Williams as Lord Keeper on the advice of the Puritans, and had offered the post to Preston. When Preston refused it, he offered it to Sir Thomas Coventry, an intimate of some of the leading Puritans. And as late as November he had invited Samuel Ward, the arch-Puritan who had made the original complaint against Montague, to preach before him. See Thomas Birch, The Court and Times of Charles I, ed. R.F. Williams (London, 1849), I, 158.

[67] Laud, VI, 249. Andrewes conferred with three of the named churchmen: Richard Neile, John Buckeridge, and William Laud. As Howson of Oxford was not a signatory of the letter, there is no indication that he was consulted. Mullinger, (The University of Cambridge, III, 44) however, claims that Howson also was involved.

the doctrine of the Church of England, recommending in the interests of peace that all controversy over the disputed points in preaching, writing, "or any other way," be forbidden.[68]

The only real question in regard to the report is its purpose. Irvonwy Morgan has suggested that the letter was really an attempt to frustrate the Puritan desire for a conference with Buckingham on the Montague affair.[69] Certainly the churchmen with Arminian sympathies had expressed some reluctance about discussing the predestination issue in Convocation.[70] Mullinger, on the other hand, has implied that Buckingham himself suggested that Charles request the report in order to establish a cause and effect background for the Duke's public avowal of support of Montague.[71] Since Charles requested the letter, and it was very unlikely that Buckingham would participate in a conference of which the king did not approve, Mullinger's interpretation of the letter would seem to be the correct one.

---

[68]Letter of January 16, 1626, ibid.

[69]Morgan, p. 158.

[70]According to Peter Heylyn, Laud had consulted Andrewes about the wisdom of bringing up the predestination issue at Convocation. Andrewes did not want to have it discussed there because of the prevalence of the Calvinistic viewpoint among the clergy (Cyprianus Anglicus..., p. 147). See also Cosin, Correspondence, Part I, p. 42.

[71]Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, III, 44.

The conference desired by the Puritans took place at York House in February of 1626.[72] Though called for February 9, the first meeting did not occur until February 11. Francis White, Dean of Carlisle, who had officially authorized the printing of the Appeale, and Montague were summoned to defend their cause. They answered the summons, but when the Puritans did not appear, the conference was postponed until the following Saturday, February 11. But by Saturday Montague had returned to Windsor; and White,

---

[72]The suggestion for the conference came specifically from Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, and Lord Saye. See John Cosin, The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham, ed. J. Sansom ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," [Oxford, 1843-55?]), II, 19, 40.

Altogether three meetings were called: the February 9 meeting which the Puritans failed to attend; a meeting on February 11, and then on February 17. There are several accounts of the February 11 meeting written by John Cosin and corrected by Francis White. (See Cosin, Works, II, 19-71, "The Sum and Substance of the Conferences Lately Had At York House Concerning Mr. Mountague's Books, Which It Pleased the Duke of Buckingham to Appoint, and With Divers Other Honourable Persons to Hear, at The Special and Earnest Request of the Earl of Warwick and the Lord Say.") John Preston also wrote an account of this meeting which subsequently was used by Thomas Ball in his biography of Preston (Life of the Renowned Doctor Preston Writ by His Pupil Master Thomas Ball in the Year 1628, ed. E.W. Harcourt [Oxford, 1885]). Both the Cosin and Preston accounts are strongly biased in favor of the opinions of their respective parties. As the Cosin account was the only one available to me, the following description of the conferences may suffer from his point of view. It should however be noted that Morgan, Mullinger, and Brewes (the editor of Fuller's The Church History...) all attribute more accuracy to the Cosin account. There is no thorough account of the February 17 meeting. Cosin's notes on it are included in his works with the following marginal comment by Archbishop Bancroft: "This is the sum, the conference itself is wanting" (Cosin, The Works..., II, 73).

who had been notified of the Saturday meeting and instructed to bring Montague with him to York House, was unable to find him. Instead he brought John Cosin. However, for some reason Buckingham preferred someone other than Cosin to speak for Montague, and for this purpose he sent also for John Buckeridge, Bishop of Rochester.[73] The chief spokesmen for the Calvinist position were Thomas Morton, Bishop Lichfield and John Preston, Buckingham's old ally.[74] Others present included Buckingham, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, James Hay, Earl of Carlisle, Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, Lord Saye, Edward Coke, and Lords Dorset, Bridgewater and Mulgrave - "a fair cross section of the aristocratic political leaders of the Puritan wing."[75]

The purpose of the conference from the point of view of the Puritans became evident with Thomas Morton's first address. With the self righteous statement that the aim of the Puritans was not to destroy Montague, but to set forth his errors so as to reform him, Morton presented seven

---

[73]Cosin, The Works..., II, 19-20.

[74]According to Morgan (p. 160), Preston originally had refused to attend the conference. But on Friday the 10 of February at a meeting at the home of the Dutchess of Enbish, Buckingham supposedly succumbed to pressure to forsake the Puritan alliance. When Preston heard that Buckingham had decided to support Montague, he changed his mind about attending the conferences at York House.

[75]Morgan, p. 161.

general charges against Montague.[76] The Puritans obviously expected the conference to be run like the House of Commons. Montague was to be considered guilty from the start, and the presentation of a defense was to be used merely for the sake of edification. The whole purpose of the affair was to illustrate to Buckingham just how guilty Montague was, thus gaining his active support in the Commons' cause.[77] To the surprise of Buckingham's old allies, the Duke interrupted the proceedings to protest against the tone and quality of the Puritan charges. He reminded Morton that James had thought well of Montague, and making good use of the letters he had received from Laud and his fellow bishops, Buckingham finally took his stand with Montague.

> The judgments of divers grave and learned prelates of this Church had yet confirmed both his Majesty and himself in the good opinion which

---

[76] Cosin, The Works..., II, 21. The charges were: (1) Montague had abused authority by publishing his books; (2) the works contained assertions in opposition to the Articles and the religion of the Church of England; (3) Montague had denied the oaths of supremacy and allegiance thereby committing no less a crime than treason; (4) he had maintained apparent heresy; (5) he had rejected and vilified the writings of King James; (6) he had overthrown the Gospel; (7) he had laid the gap open to popery.

[77] With the exception of Preston, the Puritans at York House must have expected that the Duke either would support their position or remain silent, for there is no other explanation for the haughtiness of their first presentation, and for the poor defense they presented when Buckingham "changed the rules," and put the Puritans on the defensive. Although Preston had found out that the Duke would support Montague, the discovery came too late for a change in the Puritan strategy at the first conference. See note 74.

> his late sovereign lord and master always conceived of Mr. Mountague's worth and learning...[78]

Laud insisted that the Puritans prove their case out of Montague's writings without regard to the churchman's sharpness of language and style. General charges were not enough. Montague was not on trial at the conference; his innocence was to be assumed unless the Puritans could indicate otherwise.

After Francis White had defended his licensing of the Appeale, Morton attempted to present the Puritan case on Buckingham's terms, i.e., with specific citations from Montague's works.[79] Each of these citations was refuted by Cosin and Buckeridge,[80] and Buckingham summed up the results of the first meeting in the following comment to the Puritans:

> If these be the greatest matters you be grieved with, I can see no reason but Mr. Mountague should be defended.[81]

With this the Duke was about to adjourn the meeting, but the participants decided to stay on to discuss the questions at the heart of the attack on Montague's Arminianism: the

---

[78] Cosin, The Works..., II, 40.

[79] Ibid., II, 23-24.

[80] The citations and refutations are not given here because they do not relate directly to the Arminian question.

[81] Cosin, The Works..., II, 35.

doctrine of indefectibility and the authority of the Synod of Dort.

From Cosin's account of the discussion it appears that Morton presented an ill-prepared, unorthodox, and disastrous presentation of the Calvinist doctrine.[82] He built his case upon a distinction between "justified" and "actually justified" elect. While the latter implied the remission of sins, the former did not. Consequently though a man be justified on the part of God (i.e., God had decreed his salvation), he was not actually justified and would still sin as a son of Adam. But these sins would not be imputed to him because he had been elected.[83]

White immediately accused Morton of teaching a doctrine that convinced men they were elect and would remain justified while they walked "after the flesh, and continue in foul and wilful sins."[84] Turning to Morton, Buckingham asked, "Teach you this divinity? God defend us following of it!"[85]

---

[82]If my thesis is correct, and Morton did not expect to have to defend the Calvinist opinion, the lack of preparation is not surprising.

[83]Cosin, The Works..., II, 57-59. The more orthodox procedure would have been to base his case on the omnipotence of God. He could have argued that though the justified sinned, they did not sin grievously, that the fact of their justification made them incapable of doing so.

[84]Ibid., II, 59.

[85]Ibid. Cosin notes that William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke and James Hay, Earl of Carlisle agreed that it was

When the defense of indefectibility was turned over to John Preston, he attempted to argue that the sinful elect were exonerated from divine punishment because they were God's children.[86] This immediately raised the issues of baptism and the universal application of God's grace - points dear to English Arminians and moderates as well. Accordingly White supported by Buckingham decried Preston's denial of the efficacy of baptism as a sin greater than any committed by Montague.[87]

Aware that their advocates were not presenting a convincing argument, and were getting onto dangerous ground with the issue of universal grace, Coke and Lord Saye turned the debate to the question of the Synod of Dort. Rather naively[88] they claimed that the whole question of predestination theology would be quieted "if the Synod of Dort might be established here in England."[89] White, however, would not permit them such an easy escape from the question of universality. Arguing that the Dortists covertly denied the doctrine of universality in their

---

a pernicious doctrine.

[86] Ibid., II, 37.

[87] Ibid.

[88] "Naively" because Buckingham had made it clear that his sympathies were not with the Calvinist doctrine.

[89] Cosin, The Works..., II, 38.

second article,[90] he drew attention to the weakest part of the canon which distinguished between the sufficient and the efficacious character of Christ's atonement.

> ...a great and manifest mischief it was, to have our people taught that Christ died not for them all. For if this were once admitted, how could we teach every man to believe that Christ redeemed him, as we ought to do?[91]

The real argument against the Puritan admiration for that Synod, however, was a devastating appeal to English nationalism. White warned against borrowing "a new faith from any village in the Netherlands;"[92] and the Earls of Pembroke and Carlisle urged that the Synod of Dort be left to those who submitted themselves unto it - "in England we

---

[90] Ibid., II, 63. Although the English delegation had attempted to get a compromise version of the doctrine of universality, the actual wording of the canons on the second article was ambiguous: "This death of the Son of God is... of infinite value and price abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world." "Moreover, the promise of the Gospel is that whosoever believeth in Jesus Christ crucified shall not perish, but have eternal life." Thus far the canons supported a doctrine of universal atonement. But further canons stated: "For this was the most free counsel and gracious will, and intention of God the Father, that the life giving and saving efficacy of the most precious death of His Son should exert itself in all the elect to give them alone justifying faith, and thereby lead them certainly to salvation; that is God willed that Jesus Christ by the blood of the cross (by which He has confirmed the New Covenant) should efficaciously redeem out of every people, nation and tongue all those and no others who have been elected to salvation from all eternity and given to Him by the Father."

[91] Ibid.

[92] Ibid.

have a rule of our own."[93] But it was Buckingham who closed the discussion, (and the meeting) with a slight twist of the argument so familiar to his former patron and king.

> We have nothing to do with that synod; it is all about the hidden and intricate points of predestination, which are not fit matters to trouble the people withal.[94]

At the second meeting (February 17) the Puritans returned to their earlier procedure of outlining their objections to Montague's works. Of the nine objections presented by Morton, and the three additional by Preston, the following assertions attributed to Montague dealt directly with the Arminian issue:

> 1. We go to heaven and hell according to our deservings.
>
> 2. As Lucifer fell from heaven, so man may fall from grace.
>
> 3. Arminius was not the cause of all the stirs and broils in the Low Countries.
>
> 4. Election and reprobation are not irrespective, etc.[95]

The conference lasted six hours, but as Cosin's summary is the only source available to us, the specific details

---

[93] Ibid., II, 64.

[94] Ibid. James, of course, did not use this argument after the Synod of Dort. But this was the position he held in 1613 when he was opposed to the calling of a Synod. See Chapter IV.

[95] Ibid., II, 73-74.

of the response to the above charges are not known. Cosin merely notes:

> Mr Mountague answered with perspicuous brevity and delight to all that were present, unless my Lord Say. Not a lord besides him and Warwick, but expressed themselves ashamed of such poor objections, and highly satisfied with such a plain, ingenious, and learned expression as Mr. Mountague made of himself.[96]

On the basis of Cosin's account it can be assumed that the York House Conferences were a theological victory for the Arminian sympathizers.[97] They not only had put the Puritans on the defensive, but had successfully repulsed the effort to establish the canons of Dort as the doctrine of the Church of England. The real issue, however, is not the immediate theological victory, but the long term effects of the conferences.[98] In those terms the Arminian victory

---

[96] Ibid., II, 74. From this, it is obvious that Montague did attend the February 19 meeting.

[97] Fuller, who was biased in favor of the Calvinists, notes that some considered it "a clear conquest on one, some on the other side, and a third sort of a drawn battle betwixt both." His own opinion was that "the success of these meetings answered neither the commendable intentions, nor hopeful expectations, of such who procured them" (The Church History..., VI, 34). Gardiner (The History of England..., VI, 65) writes of the conferences: "As far as it is possible to judge from the accounts which have reached us, the assailants failed to make their points good..."

[98] Joseph Mead wrote to Sir Martin Stuteville on March 5, 1626: "What good they have done I know not, but Montagu's party talk much of the success of their side" (Birch, The Court and Times of Charles I, I, 850.

was hollow. The issue of Montague had not been taken out of the hands of Parliament, and more important, the York House Conferences marked the final break between Buckingham and his Puritan allies.[99] Buckingham himself was now vulnerable, and one month after the conferences he was attacked by his old allies in the House of Commons.[100]

---

[99] Buckingham probably knew before the conference that his support of Montague would mean the end of his alliance with the Puritans. He had already spoken to Preston about Montague's works, and the Puritan almost certainly would have made that clear. See Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, III, 44.

[100] At the end of the 1625 session when the radicals made the first attack on Buckingham, the Preston group of Puritans (Eliot, Rich, and Coryton) were not yet willing to break with the favorite. The question is when did they decide to break with the favorite. Morgan has argued that the attack was a direct result of Buckingham's betrayal of the Puritans at the York House Conferences (p. 144). Hulme, on the other hand, claims that the attack began on February 10 when Eliot presented a devastating description of the failure of the Cadiz expedition - clearly pointing the finger at Buckingham without mentioning his name. According to Hulme, the attack was precipitous, and Eliot spent the rest of that month and part of March getting support for a direct attack on Buckingham (p. 112). Although Morgan may attribute too much to the York Conferences, Hulme attributes too little. Why did Eliot refrain from mentioning Buckingham by name on February 10? Why would he begin such an attack only one day before the Conference at which the Puritans expected to get Buckingham's support? Between these two extremes I tend to favor Gardiner's interpretation that the dissatisfaction with Buckingham's policy was rapidly increasing. Eliot's speech on February 10 was not so much an attack on Buckingham, but an expression of genuine concern with the failures of Charles's foreign policy. But after that speech Eliot became convinced that Buckingham had seized the French ship "St. Peter," for his own fortune and advancement. This, added to the fact that Buckingham had supported Montague, led to Eliot's denunciation of Buckingham on March 15; Lord Saye, Buckingham's other old ally, headed a comparable attack in the House of Lords. See Gardiner, VI, 61-67.

The attack on Buckingham detracted attention from Montague until April 17,[101] when John Pym's committee on religion finally presented its report on the doctrinal offenses of Montague's Gagg. To a great extent these charges were but renewals of the charges against the Appeale presented to the Commons in 1625. Montague's Gagg contained doctrines contrary to the Articles of the Church of England and the Book of Homilies; various passages in the Gagg as well as the Appeale tended to stimulate sedition between the King and his subjects and between subject and subject; moreover the whole purpose of the Gagg was to discourage the practice of true religion, and to reconcile the Church of England with popery.[102]

Again the only strictly theological concern of the committee seemed to be with the doctrine of indefectibility. The real interest of the Puritans, however, was not in specific points of doctrine but in the historical outlook of the Church of England, i.e., where the Church stood in the theological spectrum of the Reformation. Montague's assertion of defectibility would put the doctrine of the English Church in opposition to the reformed churches;[103]

---

[101] As previously noted the Parliament opened on February 6.

[102] "Mr. Pym's Report on Mr. Montague's Books Delivered in the Second Parliament of Charles," appended to Debates in the House of Commons in 1625, p. 180.

[103] Ibid., p. 181.

his derogation of the Synod of Dort represented yet another expression of the separateness of the Church of England from the Genevan world;[104] and his lack of respect for Calvin, Perkins, Beza, Whitaker, Hall and Predeaux[105] threatened the very core of the Puritan desire to Calvinize the doctrine of the Church of England. The report of the Pym committee made this desire eminently clear, and for the first time the Calvinists admitted, though indirectly, that they were not the Church of England, but one of two parties striving to capture control.[106]

Charles, meanwhile, still did not comprehend the depth of the Calvinist concern with the religious question. In 1625 he had attempted to use the religious issue in general and Montague in particular as a bargaining point with the Commons in order to get additional supply. His fumbling attempts had resulted in the Montague issue becoming a question of ministerial responsibility. Now, still in need of money and desperately interested in saving Buckingham, in 1626 Charles offered up Montague as a sacrificial lamb to the House. Three days after the presentation of Pym's report he had the Commons informed of "his Dislike of Mr

---

[104] Ibid., p. 183.

[105] Ibid. The report was to be forwarded to the Lords. There is no record of this having been done, or of any debate on Montague in the House of Lords.

[106] Ibid., p. 182.

Mountagew his Writings."

> That the Doctrine of the Books he would refer to the Convocation House; and would in future take especial Care for the Examination of all books, which should be printed, for avoiding any Matter of Sedition...[107]

Although the Commons did not respond to his offer (they continued to review the "excessive and abusive power" of Buckingham before voting supply),[108] Charles persisted in his policy of appeasement. On June 14 he issued a proclamation against "Writing, Preaching, Printing, Conferences"[109] on any opinions concerning religion save those clearly taught by the Church of England. Although the Proclamation was clearly directed against the Arminians,[110]

---

[107] Journals of the House of Commons, I, 847. Gardiner notes that Laud was grieved at Charles's desertion of Montague (The History of England..., VI, 64). For Laud the main issue was a question of who was to control the Church. For Charles it was simply a question of saving Buckingham, and getting adequate funds. Gardiner implies that Charles had forsaken Montague at the beginning of the session. But at the beginning of the session Charles had offered the House only control over certain external aspects of religion. The House itself, by an amendment of John Pym, had extended the offer to include all aspects of religion (Journals of the House of Commons, I, 817). There is no evidence that the actual desertion came before the attack on Buckingham.

[108] Gardiner, The History of England..., VI, 118-120.

[109] Rushworth, I, 412.

[110] In the Proclamation itself Charles noted "that of late some Questions and opinions seem to have broached on matters of Doctrine and Tenets of our Religion at first onely intended against Papists," but which afterwards have "given much offense to the sober and well-grounded Readers" (Rushworth, I, 412). Salvetti, the representative of the Grand Dukes of Tuscany at the English Court mentioned in a

it pleased no one for it was generally enforced against the Calvinists.[111]

Montague, meanwhile, was not unaware of the political intrigue with which his case had become involved. On at least two occasions he wrote to Cosin that either himself or Buckingham or both must be sacrificed in order that the King be furnished with money.[112] But Montague was not a willing, easy martyr for his king. He complained bitterly to Cosin throughout the summer of 1626, that the Church had not rewarded his efforts with a bishopric.[113]

> I have deserved better of the Church.
> I beate the bush and others catch
> the birds.
>
> It were better for me to have thought
> but the tittle of a Bishop, to give
> me countenance, if any thing should

---

letter to the Dukes on July 3, 1626 that the Proclamation was "meant to extinguish Arminianism which has lately been spreading in this country" (Salvetti Correspondence, appended to The Manuscripts of Henry Duncan Skrine, Esq. /"Historical Manuscripts Commission," 11th Report, Series 16, Part I (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1887)7, p. 76). See also Montague's letter to Cosin, Pettiworth, June 28, 1626, John Cosin, Correspondence ("Surtees Society," LII, /London, 1869/7), Part I, p. 95.

[111] Rushworth, I, 413; Collier, VIII, 16.

[112] Montague to Cosin, Pettiworth, June 28, 1626, Cosin, Correspondence, Part I, p. 96 and Montague to Cosin, July 1626, ibid., p. 100.

[113] Montague to Cosin, August 1626, ibid., p. 103. Montague particularly blamed Laud who was perhaps the least blameworthy. Montague did not seem to understand that Laud was struggling to retain his powerful influence within the Church, and that in terms of that struggle, Montague's personal fate was meaningless.

happen, then otherwise.[114]

The Parliament of 1626 was dismissed in June. For the next nine months Charles governed without a Parliament, financing his new war with France with forced loans and other forms of unparliamentary taxation. Montague, however, was not forgotten; the question of his popery and Arminianism continued to be debated by pamphlet, and in November of 1627 Montague wrote to Cosin: "I looke one day to be sacrificed, (unlesse I make my peace, as I can and may)..."[115]

In March of 1628 Parliament was again called into session. Before the first meeting Coke, Selden and Wentworth tried to get the Puritans represented by Eliot, Pym and Sir Robert Cotton to let the issues of religion and Buckingham wait on the question of the civil liberties that had been violated during the past nine months.[116] The Puritans went along with Wentworth until June when it became obvious that Charles would not respect the Petition of Right drawn up under Wentworth's leadership. At that point Eliot moved that a committee be established to draw up a Remonstrance setting forth all the grievances against Charles's policy. Knowing that this meant a renewal of the attack on

---

[114]Montague to Cosin, July 26, ibid., p. 98; and Montague to Cosin, August 1626, ibid., p. 99.

[115]Ibid., p. 137.

[116]Gardiner, The History of England..., VI, 230-31 and Morgan, p.198.

Buckingham, Charles immediately ordered the House to pass the subsidy bill and not to enter "into anything which may lay scandal or aspersion on the estate or the ministers thereof."[117]

The king's recalcitrance opened the flood gates to yet another attack on Buckingham. Sir Edward Coke began the attack by denouncing Buckingham for the failure of the war effort, whereupon a Mr. Shirland attempted to make a connection between this failure and the prevalence of papists and Arminians at the court.

> We have betrayed Denmark, the French protestants, the Netherlanders. Are not the prime men in Court papists, and are and have not eminent men and captains been papists? Are not the papists at home connived at and compounded with a low rate? The Arminian faction encouraged and fostered, which was that which hath overthrown the Low Countries, and though religion cannot be altered at one time yet it works much.[118]

From then on the question of Buckingham and the religious issue were intimately connected.[119] It was not simply a question of Buckingham, but of all the ministers and

---

[117] The Manuscripts of the Earl of Lonsdale ("Historical Manuscripts Commission," 13th Report, Appendix, Part VII [London, 1893], p. 36.

[118] Ibid., p. 37.

[119] One of the charges brought against Buckingham during the debates was that he had permitted York House to be a "place of consultation for the Arminians..." Ibid., p. 45.

advisers surrounding the king. They had advised him poorly in matters of religion as well as in foreign policy. Their popish religious sympathies had polluted the court and the country, and had nearly driven the state into the arms of Spain and Rome.

It is not surprising then that the Remonstrance, which was directed mainly against the political influence of Buckingham, should begin with a statement of the "general apprehension of a secret design concerted for introducing a change in religion.[120] Neither Montague nor his particular theology was mentioned. The Remonstrance was aimed at much larger targets - Laud and Neile.

With a lack of precision that was to become increasingly common in the 1640's, the Remonstrance labelled the entire Laudian party and program as Arminian. Nowhere in the Remonstrance was the term predestination mentioned. Arminianism was defined as "a more covert practice for the bringing in popery;" and Arminians as "Protestants without-side, but Jesuits within."[121] The issue was set clearly before Charles. It was no matter of indefectibility or any other aspect of predestination that lay at the root of the Calvinist complaint. It was simply a question of power and influence: the anti-Puritans (or, more appropriately,

---

[120] Rushworth, I, 620.

[121] Ibid.

Laudians) had been granted posts of honor and trust in the Church and the State; their works were published while those of the Calvinists were suppressed; and the worst had come to pass - Arminianism was "now looked on as the most thriving persuasion."[122]

The Remonstrance would settle for nothing less than the dismissal of Laud, Neile, and Buckingham, the mainstays of Charles's government. Charles had no choice; he either had to reject the Remonstrance totally, or accept the principle that Commons might compel the King to dismiss his ministers and favorites.

Charles's reply to the Remonstrance, written by Laud in the king's name,[123] abandoned all restraint in setting forth the royal prerogatives. The charge that Arminianism was but a "cunning way to bring in Popery," was, Laud claimed, an insult to the government. Parliament had far exceeded its jurisdiction in daring to teach the people that the King was "so ignorant of truth, or so careless of the possession of it,"[124] that he would permit the growth of heresy, or faction within the kingdom. The Parliament had produced no proof of the charges against Laud and Neile. As for their positions and preferments, this was the

---

[122] *Ibid.*

[123] Laud, IV, 360.

[124] *Ibid.*, VI, 9.

judgment of the king, and none of the business of Parliament.[125]

When this reply was met with the threat of yet another Remonstrance, Charles prorogued Parliament. In the interval between the prorogation (June 26, 1628) and the opening of the second session of the Parliament of 1628 (January 20, 1629), Charles attempted to reaffirm his authority over the Church. He immediately proceeded to advance and/or pardon all those churchmen who in any way had been censured or questioned by the Commons. Laud was transferred from the see of Bath and Wells to London; George Montaigne, who had licensed a sermon defending the forced loan,[126] was promoted to the see of Durham, and then to

---

[125] Ibid., VI, 10.

[126] Robert Sibthorpe, a Northampton clergyman and Roger Manwaring, rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields and chaplain ordinary to Charles had been censured and fined by Parliament for defending the forced loan. Sibthorpe's sermon, Apostolike Obedience Shewing the Duty of Subjects To Pay Tribute and Taxes to Their Princes (1627) had been refused license by Abbot for which refusal Abbot was sequestered from office and the commission to execute archiepiscopal jurisdiction was granted to the bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, Oxford, and Bath and Wells, all men of the Laudian party. The sermon was subsequently licensed by Montaigne of London. See C.S.P.D., 1627-1628, p. 157. Manwaring's sermon Religion and Allegiance (1627) was the more devastating of the two in that it asserted: "The King is not bound to observe the Laws of the Realm concerning the Subjects Rights and Liberties, but that his Royal Will and Command in imposing Loans and Taxes, without common consent in Parliament, doth oblige the Subjects Conscience upon Pain of Eternal Damnation." See Rushworth, I, 420-23.

York; Howson, one of Laud's chief supporters, was elevated to the see of Durham;[127] Roger Manwaring, who had written the unpopular sermon in support of the loan, was given Montague's old post at Stanford Rivers; and Montague finally received his bishopric - the see of Chichester.[128]

In order to protect his new appointees from further attack in the House of Commons, Charles granted pardons to Montague,[129] Sibthorpe,[130] Manwaring, and Cosin.[131] And in the hope of finally putting an end to the controversy over religion, he had a Declaration similar to the Proclamation

---

[127]Laud's other supporters Neile and Buckeridge had recently been translated to the sees of Winchester and Ely respectively.

[128]It was customary that before the consecration of a bishop, a notice was issued forth to call all persons to appear who would show cause why the bishop should not be consecrated. When Montague was to be consecrated a Mr. Humphreys (a parliament colonel) and a William Jones, a stationer of London, excepted against Montague on the basis that he was unfit for the office because he had been censured by Parliament and rendered incapable of preferment of any kind in the Church. Jones's exception was judged defective in some legal formalities, and Montague was consecrated. See Fuller, The Church History..., VI, 56-58 and Collier, VIII, 35-36.

[129]After he received his pardon, Montague was advised by Heath, the Attorney General, to rewrite his Appeale, eliminating the sarcasm and hostile tone (Gardiner, The Personal Government of Charles I /London, 1877, I, 33-34).

[130]See note 126.

[131]John Cosin had come under attack for a book of devotions which he had written at the request of the royal household which the Puritans considered to be a popish work. See Gardiner, The Personal Government..., I, 22-24; Collier, VIII, 26-27.

of 1626 prefixed to a new edition of the Thirty-nine Articles. The Articles were to be considered a clear affirmation of the doctrine of the Church of England. If any need for clarification should arise, the Convocation would decide the true sense of the teachings of the Church. In the meantime all disputes were to be laid aside, and inquiry in any form into disputed points was forbidden.[132]

Perhaps to show his good intent, Charles took the first step in clearing the air of controversial theology by calling in all the copies of Montague's works,[133] and suppressing Sibthorpe's sermons.

It is extremely difficult to understand Charles's response to the Commons except in terms of a stubborn inability to comprehend the seriousness of the concern with religious issues. It was the monarch's arrogance and lack of insight that made him believe that with a single decree he could protect the Laudian churchmen from further attack.

But misunderstanding of the "opposition" was not limited to Charles. The debates of the second session of the Parliament of 1628 (beginning on January 20, 1629) are

---

[132]Henry Gee and William John Hardy (eds.), Documents Illustrative of English Church History (London, 1896), pp. 518-520.

[133]Rushworth, I, 634-35. Rushworth says that before the Declaration Montague's books "were for the most part vented, and out of danger of seisure, and the suppressing of all writin and preaching thereunto, was (it seems by some) the thing mainly intended."

above all an indication of the Commons' complete lack of understanding of their monarch. For Charles the real issue at stake was his prerogative - in religious as well as civil, secular terms. The Commons, on the other hand, seemed to take no real cognizance of the threat they posed to monarchical authority. The issue as far as they were concerned was not the king or his authority, but the state of the Church. Consequently, although Charles repeatedly urged the House to give precedence to a consideration of the question of tonnage and poundage,[134] the Commons consistently debated the religious question. By no means was this due to a desire to thwart the monarch; to the Commons the religious problem was a real one to which was connected the very fate of the nation. In the words of Sir Walter Earle:

> As for the passing of bills, settling revenues, and the like, without settling Religion, I must confess I have no heart to it. Take away my Religion, you take my life; and not only mine, but the life of the whole State and Kingdom. For I dare boldly say, never was there (in the point of subsistence) a more near conjunction between matter of Religion and matter of State in any Kingdom in the world than there is in this Kingdom at this day.[135]

The Commons was prepared to debate the Arminian aspect

---

[134] Wallace Notestein and Frances H. Relf (eds.), Commons Debates for 1629 Critically Edited, and an Introduction Dealing with Parliamentary Sources for the Early Stuarts (Minneapolis, 1921), pp. 18, 22, 32.

[135] Ibid., p. 19.

of that religious problem, but only once in the debates does there appear a reference to the theology attributed to the Arminians.[136] Arminianism had lost its meaning as a theological doctrine, and had become a matter of political and religious subversion. The Arminian was the "spawn of a papist," purposedly alienating the king from his subjects, and breaking up Parliaments in order to open the gates to the religion of Rome and Spanish supremacy over England.[137] Arminianism was the cause of all the troubles at home and abroad, for surely the failures of Charles's foreign policies and the alienation between the king and his Parliament were but God's punishment for the lack of care given to the true religion.[138]

But it was not Charles who was to be held responsible for the growth and flourishing of this evil. It was the new faction of clergy that "drop into the ears of his Majesty, ...that those that oppose them oppose his Majesty ...tell him he may do what he pleaseth with goods, lives and Religion."[139] Even the Declaration forbidding the disputation of controversial theology was not attributed to

---

[136] Ibid., p. 13. The first speaker, Francis Rous, refers to Arminianism as making "the grace of God lackey it after the will of man, that maketh the sheep to keep the shepherd, that maketh mortal seed of an immortal God."

[137] Ibid.

[138] Ibid., p. 16.

[139] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

Charles. It was the work of Laud and Noile, "the main and great roots (of all those evils which are come upon us and our Religion."[140] Buckingham had died in 1628; the Arminian clergy now replaced him as the scapegoats for all the country's ills.

The House did not limit itself to reciting the problems and their causes. On January 27 Pym, in presenting the report of his committee on religion, set forth the right, indeed the obligation, of the House to interpret the true doctrine of the Church of England, and to investigate those who strayed from that truth.[141] Two days later when the House went into a general committee on religion, John Eliot, expanding on Pym's claims, set forth the Parliamentary case against the Declaration. Charles had claimed therein that Convocation and Convocation alone would clarify the doctrine of the Church. But, argued Eliot, the Convocation included in its membership the very men whom Parliament had charged with bringing in this ill-defined evil, this covert form of popery; the very men who would use this heresy to destroy the Kingdom and the Church.

> ...all are not such, so free, sound and orthodox in Religion as they should be, witness the men complained of, and you know what power they have. Witness the man nominated lately, Mr. Mountague. I reverence the order,

---

[140] Ibid., pp. 34, 35.

[141] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

> I honour not the man; others may be named as bad. I apprehend such fear, that should it be in their power, we may be in danger to have our whole Religion overthrown.[142]

Not Convocation and king, but Parliament and king must be the defenders of the true faith. It was now time for the House to lay down the true doctrine of the Church, and from there to consider its offenders.[143]

This revolutionary motion was more easily delivered than carried out. The House responded to Eliot's plea for laying "down a rule on which all may rest" with the following unclear resolution.

> That we the Commons now in Parliament assembled to do claim, profess, and avow for truth, the sense of the Articles of Religion, which were established in Parliament in the 13th year of Queen Elizabeth, which by the public acts of the Church of England, and by the general and current exposition of the writers of our Church, hath been delivered unto us; and we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians wherein they do differ from us.[144]

In spite of its deep concern with religion, the Commons was unable to get at the source of the theological difficulties that had plagued the Church since 1595 if not earlier. Despite all protests to the contrary, the sense

---

[142] Ibid., p. 27.

[143] Ibid., p. 28.

[144] Ibid., p. 23.

of the Articles was not clear in respect to predestination. And for that matter the House itself was not certain what was meant by the phrase "public acts of the Church of England" which was contained in its own resolution. Sir Nathaniel Rich would have included the Lambeth Articles, the Articles of the Church of Ireland, the conclusions of the Synod of Dort, the readings of the public professors in the Universities, and the Homilies as "public acts of the Church of England."[145] John Selden, on the other hand, claimed that since none of these had received the assent of Convocation, they could not be considered "public acts."[146] Two other speakers refused to grant the title "public acts" even to what had been determined in Convocation for "that only is said to be a publique act which is considered of, debated, disputed and resolved on by King and all the State."[147]

The issue could not be resolved in committee. But on

---

[145]Rich argued that Barret's recantation for preaching against the Lambeth Articles was in print by authority (ibid., pp. 119-20). He was somewhat confused. Barret preached his sermon before the Articles were drawn up. The debate over the inclusion of the Lambeth Articles, the Articles of Ireland, and the conclusions reached at the Synod of Dort is found only in Nicholas's notes.

[146]Selden claimed that no authority had been granted the Synod of Dort "albeit our men were sent over by pub(lique) authority; for there were other divines as of the Palatinate, etc." (ibid., p. 119).

[147]Ibid., p. 120

February 3 Eliot satisfied himself and the rest of the House with the decision that although the authority of the Lambeth Articles might be open to question, there was no doubt of the truth of them. And on the basis of that truth, he urged the House to proceed in the investigation of the Arminians.[148]

With this declaration of defiance against Charles's own Declaration, the House proceeded to investigate the legality of Montague's elevation to bishop,[149] and various and sundry charges against John Cosin, Laud, and Neile.[150] But the most absurd of the investigations taken on by this Parliament was the search into the pardons granted Cosin, Montague, Manwaring and Sibthorpe. With a naivete that is almost incomprehensible, the House seemed to feel that if they could discover the source of the pardons, then Charles most certainly would rid himself and the Church of the guilty party. Even now there was no willingness to recognize that Charles himself was the guilty party. Instead the guilt was cast upon Neile, Bishop of Winchester and

---

[148] Ibid., pp. 33-34.

[149] The particular interest here was in the exception of Jones. See note 128 and ibid., pp. 36. 43, 53-55.

[150] The charge against Cosin was that he had introduced popish doctrine and discipline into the Cathedral at Durham (ibid., pp. 37, 43-44). Laud was charged with permitting the publication of Arminian works, and refusing license to Calvinistic ones (ibid., pp. 58-59). And Neile supposedly had rebuked a clergyman for attacking a fellow who had preached popish, Arminian doctrine (ibid., pp. 50-51; 59-60).

Laud's chief supporter.[151]

The need to obtain witnesses in order to press the charges made against Neile stayed the debate on religion until the end of February. In the meantime the House turned to the question of tonnage and poundage. In the process of that debate they were finally forced to face the fact that what Charles's ministers did "was either by his own direct order and command, or by order of the council-board, himself being present and assisting..."[152]

Though faced with this ugly truth, the House still persisted in separating the king from his clergy. On February 24[153] the sub-committee on religion set before the House "certain heads and articles of religion" to be presented to Charles wherein again reaffirming their faith in the King's own piety and good intentions, they attribute all the ills that had befallen the Church to "the unfaithfulness and carelessness"[154] of the Laudian clergy. All the charges that had been laid against the Arminians and their theology in the process of the debates were repeated; the orthodoxy of the Lambeth Articles, the Articles of the Church of

---

[151] Ibid., p. 59.

[152] Ibid., p. 94. See also pp. 167-68, 236-37.

[153] Gardiner (The Personal Government..., I, 87) gives the date as February 26, but admits in a note that there is a difficulty with that date. The Commons Debates for 1629 gives February 24.

[154] Commons Debates for 1629, pp. 95-96.

Ireland, and the canons of the Synod of Dort were affirmed. And upon Laud and Neile who "have discountenanced and hindered the preferment of those that are orthodox, and favored such as are contrary"[155] was laid the burden of guilt for the sad state of the Church and the kingdom. The "Heads and Articles" closed with a series of recommendations for remedying the situation, among which were included the following: (1) the works of Montague and Cosin should be burned; (2) the authors and/or abettors of the popish and Arminian doctrines should be punished; (3) some good order should be established for the licensing of books; (4) the King, with the advice of his Privy Council, should confer bishoprics and other ecclesiastical offices only upon "learned, pious, and orthodox men."[156] But most important for the fate of the Arminian theology, the sub-committee advocated:

> The orthodox doctrine of our Church in these now controverted points by the Arminian sect, may be established and freely taught, according as it hath been hitherto generally received, without any alteration or innovation, and severe punishment by the same laws to be provided against such as shall publish either by word or writing any thing contrary thereunto.[157]

---

[155] Ibid., p. 100.

[156] Ibid.

[157] Ibid.

These recommendations were never voted upon in the House. The next day Charles called for an adjournment for a week. When the House met again on March 2, it was obvious that there would be a second adjournment. In an effort to get into the record a formal complaint against the payment of tonnage and poundage and the lack of orthodoxy within the Church, there occurred the famous scene in which the Speaker was held in his chair while the following resolution was read:[158]

> Whosoever shall bring in innovation in religion, or by favour seek to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, or other opinions disagreeing from the true and orthodox church, shall be reputed a capital enemy to this Kingdom and the Commonwealth.[159]

The Parliament was not to be called into session again for eleven years. The religious issue, of which Arminianism was a crucial part, had played a major role in the final break between the King and the Parliament. Charles had had no understanding of the importance of the religious question; he had alternately ignored it and used it as a bargaining instrument with the House. The Commons, on the other hand, not only had not understood Charles, but had not faced the real implications of its demands. Blinded

---

[158]This was one of two resolutions. The other was concerned with the levying of subsidies of tonnage and poundage not granted by Parliament.

[159]Commons Debates for 1629, p. 101.

by that self-righteous sense of orthodoxy to which Puritanism was peculiarly prone, the House had pled religious truth when it really meant ecclesiastical power.

It was not coincidence that the issue of tonnage and poundage and the issue of religion were joined in that fianl resolution. Both involved nothing less than the usurpation of the king's prerogative - the one in civil affairs, the other, in matters of Church and doctrine. The real crisis was a constitutional one involving parliamentary claims to authority in areas traditionally reserved to the monarch.

In 1629 the conflict with the monarch in regard to civil affairs was faced squarely; the church conflict was not. It was never the power of the monarch, but that of the Convocation that the House claimed. But the very churchmen whom the House found objectionable were the churchmen most pleasing to Charles. This was never recognized. The constitutional aspect of the religious issue - monarchical versus parliamentary control of the Church - was hidden behind the attack on Laudian churchmen, just as the real theological problems raised by Arminianism were hidden behind the threat of popery.

C H A P T E R VIII

CONCLUSION

English Arminianism and the controversy over predestination theology in England grew out of the lack of precision with which the Elizabethan Church had set forth its doctrine of predestination. Between 1595, when the controversy over Arminianism emerged in its fullest theological form at Cambridge University, and 1629, when it had become a question of which "party" was to have control over the Church of England, no clarification of the predestination theology taught by the Church of England was effected. The failure to arrive at such clarification was due in large measure to the fact that the development of the Arminian controversy was influenced by the religious policies and personalities of James and Charles.

The closest the controversy came to defining the doctrine of the Church was with the Lambeth Articles in 1596. But these Articles were the result of the influence and power held by the Calvinists within Cambridge rather than the product of theological debate and dialogue. Moreover, the Calvinist attempt to bring the theology of the Church of England closer to that of the Genevan Reformation was frustrated by Elizabeth's insistence that peace be maintained in the University (as in the Church)

by means of a broad theological framework, and not by specific compromises with any one dominant theological school of thought. No such theological basis was to be given to the direction of the Arminian controversy during the reigns of James and Charles.

James came to the throne of England as a Calvinist in theology and an Erastian in Church-State relations. As such he might have been able to give positive direction to the theological controversy which the Calvinist victory at Cambridge had stilled, but not silenced. However, the dominant force in James's policy was his great concern with legitimacy, stability, and royal prerogative, and not his religious knowledge and insight.

Because of his Scottish heritage James tended to see religious dissension as a threat to political stability, and to identify public expressions of religious dissent with threats to monarchical authority. It was on this basis, not on theological grounds, that James responded to the religious issues that faced him when he came to the English throne. Despite his claims and dreams of being a theologian-king, when James wrote about the Puritans, he discussed the threat they posed to monarchical authority and to peace in the church and state; when he wrote about Rome and the Catholic Church, he discussed the threat of papal supremacy and Jesuistic sedition; and when he wrote about the Arminians, he discussed the dangers of theological

innovation and political sedition.

But James's concern with sedition was not merely verbal. Insofar as James's policies in regard to Dutch Arminianism had a specific theoretical basis, it lay in his desire to avoid lending his personal support to any religious movement or theology suspect of sectarianism. By 1618 he had become convinced that the Arminian Remonstrants were "sectaries" and rebels breeding discontent in the state and the church.

The Realpolitik basis for James's role in the Dutch Arminian affair was his need for money and his inability to gain adequate financial support from the Parliament. He supported the Remonstrants in the Netherlands when he saw a source of revenue in such support; and he switched his allegiance to the contra-Remonstrants when his political-economic situation called for such a switch. When his need for money did not dominate his religious policy, his conservative fears of aiding and abetting religious upheaval did.

James approached the Arminian problem in England from a similar non-theological point of view. He patronized and surrounded himself with churchmen of the Arminian persuasion whose theories of divine right monarchy buttressed royal prerogative. But while he encouraged their political theories, he did not permit them to express publicly their discontent with Calvinistic theology.

Moreover, having declared that the complexities of predestination theology were suitable only for debate among schoolmen and academicians, once he had taken a definite stand against the Dutch Arminians, he attempted to suppress any debate over predestination within the English Universities. By so doing, he not only compromised the intellectual integrity of the churchmen at court, but inhibited the possibility of an open, intellectual confrontation between the liberal Arminian and the orthodox Calvinist theologies.

James's inability to cope with theology qua theology, and his insistence that his clergy keep their controversial theological opinions private were reflected in the tone and quality of the Jacobean church and clergy. The real theologians at James's court, such as Andrewes and Overall, were products of the Elizabethan Church. Their willingness to observe public silence when it came to the predestination issue did not destroy their genuinely deep interest in the subject. The practical and political younger generation of Arminian clergy, such as Laud, Neile, and Buckeridge, did not have to practice the duplicity James forced upon their Elizabethan elders, for they put no high premium on theological intellectuality or involvement with the intricacies of predestination theology.

To a great extent the theologizing of the Jacobean clergy was limited to endorsements of passive obedience,

the divine right of monarchy, and of the divine origins of episcopacy. Their sympathies with Arminianism were not expressed in theological terms, but in their support of Richard Montague. Moreover, that support was motivated more by the threat of the Calvinists within the House of Commons than by a strong coincidence of theological views.

Montague was the exception among the Jacobean Arminians. Yet even his theological concern with predestination was narrow and limited in scope. If he is to be believed, he did not read Arminius's works until after Yates and Ward had charged him with being an Arminian. He had discussed the major issues in the predestination controversy, and had made reference to the Synod of Dort in the Gagg. But he had not been interested in reading the works that had been condemned by that Synod.

James's influence on the history of the Arminian controversy also extended to the content of that controversy. Although the motivation behind James's policy is discernible from an historical perspective, the policy was ambiguous and indecisive theologically. At the Hampton Court Conference James refused to recognize the authority of the Lambeth Articles, but later he saw fit to have the theology of those Articles incorporated into the Articles of the Irish Church. He was the major foreign force behind the Synod of Dort, but supported clergymen who privately disagreed with the findings of the Synod, and even backed

Montague whose disagreement with that Synod had been stated publicly.

By the end of James's reign disputes over the authority of the Lambeth Articles, the implications and significance of the English participation in the formulation of the canons of the Synod of Dort, and the nature of James's own theological position were complicating the major issues in the controversy over Arminianism.

In spite of these complications, the controversy essentially remained a theological issue. With the accession of Charles, however, the controversy rapidly assumed a political dimension.

Charles inherited his father's great concern with royal prerogative and his Erastian approach to church matters. He disliked Puritanism, but unlike his father, he lacked a deep personal theological commitment, and underestimated the importance of the religious concerns of others. This factor, combined with the increased fears of popery aroused by Charles's Catholic marriage, the Calvinists' distrust of the growing influence of anti-Puritan clergymen within the Church, and the rapidly evolving constitutional crisis over Buckingham's failures in foreign policy, resulted in a complete change in the character of the Arminian controversy.

The term "Arminianism" gradually was extended in meaning. No longer did it simply denote a particular

theology of predestination. To this sense of the word the Calvinists added the connotation of some link to Roman popery. The change was due partially to the unfortunate fact that Montague had set forth the Arminian interpretation of predestination theology in a work that was directed specifically toward showing the similarities between the doctrines of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church. In addition, to the Calvinist mind the Arminian position on free will was precariously close to the Roman doctrine of good works. More generally, the tendency to regard Arminianism as popery in disguise was due to the general sense of insecurity of the English Calvinists who, faced with a Catholic queen and an anti-Puritan king, were inclined to see the hand of Rome in any anti-Calvinist doctrine.

Thus in terms of the Calvinist fears the timing of the Montague affair was extremely dangerous. When it became clear that the Laudian churchmen, already suspect for their claims regarding the episcopacy and their anti-Puritan love of ritual and ceremony, also supported Montague's interpretation of the theological nature of the Church of England, the Calvinists extended the use of the word "Arminian" still further as an opprobrious term for the Laudian party.

Consequently by 1629 the controversy over predestination had become a means of exchanging charges and

accusations: the Laudian churchmen were attempting to bring popery into the Church of England; the Calvinist churchmen were attempting to subjugate the Church of England to the reformer of Geneva by way of canons set forth "in some little village in the Netherlands."

But because of Charles's lack of understanding of and insensitivity to the importance of the religious issue, between 1625 and 1629 the dispute over Arminianism took on even greater dimensions. It became one of the major expressions of the parliamentary struggle for independent and real political power.

Almost every move that Charles made from the time that he intervened in the Montague affair until the dissolution of 1629 involved some blunder. Charles had no comprehension of the seriousness of the Calvinistic fear that the Church of England was being directed away from the Protestantism of the Genevan Reformation - fear which lay behind the attack on Montague's works in the House of Commons. By appointing Montague to the royal chaplaincy he not only increased that fear, but also, by not recognizing the intransigence of the House on the religious issue, he escalated the investigation of the controversial clergyman into an issue of ministerial responsibility.

Moreover, when Charles finally was willing to sacrifice Montague in order to save Buckingham, he did not understand that the Arminian issue had gone beyond both the particular

fate of Montague and the question of ministerial responsibility. It had become the focus for a Calvinist attack on the power and influence of the Laudian clergy.

By the time that the Commons presented their Remonstrance to Charles, the situation was clearly out of control. In his relations with the House of Commons Charles consistently had been motivated by a concern for his royal prerogative. Now the House made a direct claim on that prerogative. Charles's belief that he could put an end to the whole religious question with a declaration was almost as naive as the Commons's belief that they could attack the king's church and churchmen without attacking the king. The real problem with the Parliament of 1629 was this complete lack of understanding on both sides. Charles did not understand that he was no longer in control of the situation - that the initiative for its resolution no longer rested with him. And the House did not understand that they were really asking the king to relinquish his prerogative in church matters. They continued to separate Charles from the church which he governed, and blinded themselves to the realities of their demands by the myth of sharing in the control of the Church. Prerogative in the Jacobean sense could never be shared. It would take eleven years of government without Parliament before this fact would be fully understood.

During these eleven years the Laudian party gained

control of the administration of the Church of England. Insofar as English Arminianism served as a theological framework for Laudianism, it shared in the Laudian triumph. However, not unlike the Lambeth Articles, this triumph was the product of influence and power, not of intellectual development.

Laudian Arminianism was the heritage of the theological policies of James and Charles. In the 1630's the Laudian prelates were no more inclined toward theological speculation than they had been during the earlier period examined in this study. Their support of the Arminian doctrine of predestination was more a rejection of Calvinistic claims than an affirmation of the liberal theology. Their real interest lay in consolidating their control over the Church by developing the doctrines of apostolic succession and passive obedience, and in attaining complete unity in church ritual and ceremony.

In the face of this interest there was little room for the encouragement of unimpeded inquiry into the nature of divine predestination, divine justice, and mortal free will. The intellectual potential of the theological issues raised by the controversies over predestination theology at Cambridge in 1595-96 was never realized within the Laudian Church program. Instead, in their effort to impose absolute conformity upon the Church of England, in the 1630's the Laudian prelates became no less oppressive

and dogmatic than their Calvinistic predecessors.

Appendix I

The Eight Questions Put to Barret by Whitaker and the Heads[1]

1. Whether Christ prayed for Peter only, that his faith should not fail; or also for all the elect, that they fall not away from faith and salvation, either finally, or for a time totally.

2. Whether justifying faith is not in reality distinct and diverse from an hypocritical, feigned, and dead faith.

3. Whether justifying faith doth not make us certain of our election and adoption, and persuade, without all doubt, that we shall be saved.

4. Whether any godly and faithful Christian ought not to believe the remission of his sins.

5. Whether it was an extraordinary and private revelation, concerning which St. Paul maketh mention, Rom., viii. 38 "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, etc., shall be able to separate us from the love of God, etc."

6. Whether God from eternity hath predestinated certain men to life; and reprobated certain. And why?

7. Whether he doth not acknowledge it a fault, in that he inveighed so bitterly and contumeliously against those excellent men, Peter Martyr, John Calvin, Theodore Beza, Hierom, Zanchius.

8. Whether he made a retractation in St. Mary's church the 10th of May, and will stand to it, or not: and how far?

---

[1]In Strype, The Life and Acts..., II, 263.

Appendix II

Lambeth Articles

Whitaker Draft	Final Draft
1. God from eternity has predestined some men to life, and reprobated some to death.	1. Same
2. The efficient cause of Predestination is not the foreseeing of faith; or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything innate in the person of the predestinated, but only the absolute and simple will of God.	2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not the foreseeing of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything innate in the person of the predestinated, but only the will of the good pleasure of God.
3. There is a determined and certain number of predestined, which cannot be increased or diminished.	3. Same
4. Those not predestined to salvation are inevitably condemned on account of their sins.	4. Same
5. A true, lively and justifying faith, and the sanctifying spirit of God, is not lost, nor does it pass away either totally or finally in those who once have been partakers of it.	5. A true, lively and justifying faith, and the sanctifying spirit of God, is not lost, nor does it pass away either totally or finally in the elect.
6. The truly faithful man - that is, one endowed with justifying faith - is sure by certainty of faith of the remission of his sins and his eternal salvation through Christ.	6. The truly faithful man - that is, one endowed with justifying faith - is sure by full assurance of faith of the remission of his sins and his eternal salvation through Christ.

7. Grace sufficient to salvation is not granted, not made common, not ceded to all men, by which they might be saved, if they wish.	7. Saving grace is not granted, is not made common, is not ceded to all men, by which they might be saved, if they wish.
8. No one can come to Christ unless it be granted to him, and unless the Father draws him; and all men are not drawn by the Father to come to the Son.	8. Same
9. It is not in the will or the power of each and every man to be saved.	9. Same

Appendix III

F.G. Sancti Nicolai apud Trinobantes Minister's Critique of the Lambeth Articles: Articuli Lambethani (1660)

The history to which Andrewes's "Judgment of the Lambeth Articles" was attached contained in addition to its historical account of the Whitaker-Whitgift compromise, a critique of the articles. The author of the treatise entitled, Articuli Lambethani (1660), described himself as F.G. Sancti Nicolai apud Trinobantes Minister. Hereafter he is referred to as "F.G."

F.G. admitted the first article as it stood provided that "by the first 'some' is understood the 'believers,' by the second 'some,' 'the unbelievers.'"[1]

In the second article F.G. stressed the conditional as opposed to the absolute will behind the decree of reprobation. Man alone was responsible for damnation for "it has pleased God to save every single man who believes."[2]

F.G. interpreted the third article to mean that the number of elect was certain because it was foreknown, not because it was ordained irrespective of man's will and action.

---

[1] Andrewes, A Pattern of..., p. 290, "per primum 'quosdam' intelligantur 'credentes,' per secundum 'quosdam' 'increduli.'"

[2] Ibid., "...placuit Deo servare singulos homines, si crederent."

The fourth article was acceptable even as Whitaker had drafted it as long as it was understood that reprobation and damnation were the results of God's infallible foreknowledge of man's choices. "...if one insists 'sins and damnation' are derived by necessity from predestination and holds that they are products of it, then...with the Manicheans one makes God of necessity the author of sin."[3]

F.G.'s comments on the fifth article merely noted that the change from "in those who once have been partakers of it" to "in the elect" involved a rejection of Calvin in favor of Augustine. The latter had taught that "faith is a common gift to the elect and the damned, but perseverance is only given to the elect. Calvin, however said that 'true and justifying faith only befalls the saved and elect.'"[4]

In Article VI F.G., like Andrewes, preferred "hope of faith" to "certainty of faith." He claimed that some of the Lambeth theologians also preferred the former phrasing, but were absent when the issue was decided. In support of his preference F.G. quoted Augustine, De Civita Dei, (xi, 12 b.) - "Predestination from our point of view is uncertain

---

[3] Ibid., p. 291. "...ut et 'peccata' et 'damnationem' necessitate qua dam ex ipsa praedestinatione deducas atque ex ea fluere existime aperte...cum Manichaeis Deum peccati auctorum necesse est facias."

[4] Ibid., "...fidem vero esse commune donum electis et reprobis, sed perseverantiam electis propriam: Calvinus autem, 'veram et justificantem fidem solis salvandis et electis contingere.'"

as long as we remain in the dangers of our present life."[5]

His comments on Article VII in general repeated those on Articles II and IV. Man, not God, was responsible for the fact that all were not saved. God gave grace sufficient for salvation to all, but did not give to all the efficacious grace by which men indeed were saved. Consequently the article should read: "'efficacious grace' (gratia consummans)" rather than 'saving grace' (gratia salutaris) "is not granted to all."[6]

F.G. accepted Article VIII as it stood claiming that the "Lambeth theologians did not understand (with Whitaker) that 'being drawn' was an irresistible physical determination. Rather it was a divine operation, similar to the one that operates in general in the conversion of man, one which does not take away the free nature of the will, but makes it first 'suitable' for the spiritual good, and then perpetuates the good itself."[7]

The comments on IX reaffirmed the above affirmation of free will. The primary cause of salvation, i.e.,

---

[5]"Praedestinatio apud nos, dum in praesentis vitae periculis versamur, incerta est."

[6]Ibid., p. 293.

[7]Ibid., "'Tractum' autem theologi Lambethani non intellexerunt (cum Whitakero) determinationem physicam irresistibilem, sed divinam operationem, prout communiter in conversione hominis operatur, quae naturam voluntatis liberam non tollit sed ad bonum spirituale indoneam primo facit, deinde et ipsam bonam facet."

"preventing grace," worked independently of man; but secondarily, salvation was effected "through the free willing of man by which he consents and accepts" God's gift of grace.[8]

---

[8] Ibid., p. 294. "...secundario ab arbitio et voluntate hominis consentiente atque acceptaute."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Public Documents

Commons' Debates, 1621. Edited by Wallace Notestein, Francis H. Relf, and Hartley Simpson. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1935.

The Commons' Debates For 1629 Critically Edited, And an Introduction Dealing With Parliamentary Sources For the Stuarts. Edited by Wallace Notestein and Francis H. Relf. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1921.

Debates in the House of Commons in 1625 Edited From a MS in the Library of Sir Rainald Knightley, Bart. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. ("Camden Society," NS Vol. VI.) London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1872-73.

The Diurnall Occurrences of Every Dayes Proceeding in Parliament...Which Ended 10 March Anno. Dom. 1628. London, 1641.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, 1603-1631. 1603-1625 edited by Mary Anne Everett Green; 1625-1631 edited by John Bruce. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans and Roberts, 1858.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy, 1603-1632. Vols. IX-XII edited by H.F. Brown; Vols. XIII-XXII edited by A.B. Hinds. London: HM Stationery Office, 1898-1916.

Great Britain. Journals of the House of Commons, 1547-1628. Vol. I.

Great Britain. Journals of the House of Lords, 1578-1642. Vols. II-IV.

Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords, Officially Taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, A.D. 1621. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. ("Camden Society," Vol. CIII.) London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1870.

Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords, Officially Taken by Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliaments, A.D. 1624 and 1626. Edited by Samuel Rawson Gardiner. ("Camden Society," NS Vol. XXIV. London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1879.

Select Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. Edited by G.W. Prothero. 4th edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Books and Pamphlets

Ailward, John. An Historical Narration of the Judgment of Some Most Learned and Godly English Bishops, Holy Martyrs, and Others, Concerning God's Election, and Merit of Christ His Death. London, 1631.

Andrewes, Lancelot. A Pattern of Catechistical Doctrine and Other Minor Works. ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.") Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1846.

_____. The Works of Lancelot Andrewes Sometime Bishop of Winchester. 11 vols. Edited by J.P. Wilson and J. Bliss. ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.") Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1841-54.

Arminius, James. The Works of James Arminius, D.D., Formerly Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden. Translated and edited by J. Nichols and W.R. Bagnall. 3 vols. Auburn and Buffalo: Derby, Miller and Orton, 1853.

Balcanqual, Walter. "Dr. Balcanqual's Letters From the Synod of Dort to the Right Honorable, Sir Dudley Carlton," in John Hales, Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable Mr. John Hales of Eaton College, etc. London: Thomas Newcomb, 1673, 1711.

Bancroft, Richard. A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 9 of Februarie...1588. London, 1588.

Barlow, William. "The Summe and Substance of the Conference Which It Pleased His Excellent Majestie to Have With the Lords Bishops, and Others of His Clergie (At Which the Most of the Lords of the Councill were Present) in His Majesties Privie-Chamber, at Hampton Court, January 14, 1603," in A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings Connected With the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, From the Year 1558 to the Year 1690. Edited by Edward Cardwell. Oxford: University Press, 1840.

Baro, Peter. "Fower Sermons and Two Questions as They Were Uttered and Disputed ad clerum in S. Maries Church and Schools in Cambridge," appended to A Special Treatise of Gods Providence and of Comfort Against All Kinde of Crosses and Calamities To Be Fetched from the Same, by Andreas Gerordus. Translated by J.L(udham.) London, 1583.

_____. Petri Baronis, Stenipani Sacrae Theologiae in Academia Cantabrigiensi Doctoris ac Professoris in Jonam Prophetam Praelectiones. London, 1579.

_____. Summa Trium de Praedestinatione Sententiarium. London, 1613.

Bedingfield, Robert. A Sermon Preached At Pauls Crosse the 24 of October 1624. Oxford, 1625.

Birch, Thomas. The Court and Times of Charles the First. Edited by R.F. Williams. 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1848.

_____. The Court and Times of James the First. Edited by R.F. Williams. 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1849.

A Briefe Censure Upon An Appeale to Caesar. 1626.

Burton, Henry. Babel No Bethel. That Is, the Church of Rome No True Visible Church of Christ. London, 1629.

_____. Israels Fast, Or A Meditation Upon the Seventh Chapter of Joshua. London, 1628.

_____. Plea To An Appeale: Traversed Dialogue Wise. London, 1626.

Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honorable the Marquess of Salisbury Preserved At Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. ("Historical Manuscripts Commission," Series 9, Part XV.) London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1930.

Calvin, Jean. Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God. Translated with an introduction by John Kilman S. Reid. London: James Clarke and Co., 1961.

_____. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Edited by John T. McNeil. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

Calvin, Jean and Sadoletto, Jacopo. A Reformation Debate: Sadoleto's Letter to the Genevans and Calvin's Reply. Edited by John C. Olin. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Cardwell, Edward, (ed.). Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England. 2 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1844.

Carleton, Dudley. Sir Dudley Carleton's Letters 1615-1620. London, 1775.

_____. The Speech of Sir Dudley Carleton, Lord Ambassadour For the King of Great Britaine, October 6, 1617. London, 1618.

Carleton, George. An Examination of Those Things Wherein The Author of the Late Appeale Holdeth the Doctrine of the Pelagians and Arminians To Be the Doctrine of the Church of England. London, 1626.

A Collection of Tracts Concerning Predestination and Providence and Other Points Depending Upon Them. Cambridge: University Press, 1719.

Convocation Book of MDCVI Commonly Called Bishop Overall's Convocation Book. London, 1690.

Corro, Antonio de. A Theological Dialogue, Wherein the Epistle of S. Paul the Apostle To the Romans Is Expounded. London, 1575.

Cosin, John. Correspondence. 2 vols. ("Surtees Society," Vols. LII and LV.) London: Blackwood and Sons, 1869-72.

_____. The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham. Edited by J. Sansom. 5 vols. ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," Vols. XXXIV-XXXVIII.) Oxford: Parker Society, 1843-55.

"The Second Helvetic Confession," in Creeds of the Churches: A Reader in Christian Doctrine From the Bible to the Present, pp. 131-92. Edited by John H. Leith. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1963.

Ellis, Henry (ed.). Original Letters Illustrative of English History. Vol. III. London: Harding, Triphook, and Lepard, 1825.

Featley, Daniel. A Parallel. Or the New-Old Pelagiarminian Error. London, 1626.

_____. Pelagius Redivius. Or Pelagius Raked Out of the Ashes By Arminius and His Scholars. London, 1626.

_____. A Second Parallel Together With a Writ of Error Sued Against the Appealer. London, 1626.

Firth, Charles, (ed.). Stuart Tracts, 1603-1693. Westminster: Constable, 1903.

Forbes, John. A Treatise Tending to Cleare the Doctrine of Justification. Middelburg, 1616.

Gee, Henry and Hardy, William John, (eds.). Documents Illustrative of English Church History. London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.

Goode, William, (ed.). Two Treatises On the Church, the First By Thomas Jackson, D.D., the Second By Robert Sanderson, D.D. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1843.

Goodman, Godfrey. The Court of King James the First. 2 vols. Edited by John S. Brewer. London: Richard Bentley, 1839.

Goodwin, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D., Sometimes President of Magdalene Colledge In Oxford. 5 vols. London, 1681-1704.

Grotius, Hugo. Hugo Grotius of The Authority of The Highest Powers About Sacred Things; Or, the Right of the State In the Church. London, 1651.

Hales, John. Golden Remains of the Ever Memorable Mr. John Hales of Eaton College, etc. London: Thomas Newcomb, 1673, 1711.

Halliwell-Phillipps, James Orchard, (ed.). The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes. 2 vols. London, 1845.

Harsnett, Samuel. "A Sermon Preached At S. Paul's Cross in London," appended to Three Sermons By Dr. Richard Stewart, Dean of St. Paul's By Richard Stewart. London, 1648.

Haweis, Oliver Willyams. Sketches of the Reformation and Elizabethan Age, Taken From the Contemporary Pulpit. London; William Pickering, 1844.

Heywood, T. and Wright, T., (eds.). Cambridge University Transactions During the Puritan Controversies. 2 vols. London, 1854.

Hooker, Richard. Of the Lawes of Ecclesiasticall Politie. Edited by John Keble. 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1836.

_____. The Works of That Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker, With an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton. Edited by John Keble. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1858.

Instructions Directed From the Kings Most Excellent Majestie, Unto All the Bishops of This Kingdome, and Fit To Be Put in Execution, Agreeable To the Necessitie of the Time. London, 1626.

Jackson, Thomas. An Exact Collection of the Works. London, 1654.

James I. His Majesties Declaration Concerning His Proceedings With the States Generall of the United Provinces of the Low Countries in the Cause of D. Conradus Vorstius. London, 1612.

_____. The Works of the Most High and Mighty Prince James, King, etc. Published by James Bishop of Winton, and Deane of His Majesties Chappel Royall. London, 1616.

Jewel, John. The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury. Edited by John Ayre. 4 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1845-50.

A Joint Attestation Avowing That the Discipline of the Church of England was not Impeached by the Synode of Dort. London, 1626.

Laud, William. The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God William Laud. Edited by W. Scott and J. Bliss. 7 vols. ("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology,") Oxford: Parker Society, 1847-60.

Laurence, R., (ed.). Authentic Documents Relating to the Predestinarian Controversy, Which Took Place Among Those Who Were Imprisoned For Their Adherence to the Doctrines of the Reformation by Queen Mary. Oxford, 1819.

"Letter from Hugo de Groot to L. Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester," in Transactions of the Grotius Society, Vol. XXII (1937), 133-36.

Leighton, Alexander. An Appeal to the Parliament Or Sions Plea Against the Prelacie. London, 1628.

Luther, Martin. D. Martin Luther's Werke. 13 vols. Weimar: H. Bohlau, 1930-38.

_____. "The Enslaved-Will," in Erasmus-Luther, Discourse on Free Will. Translated and edited by Ernst F. Winter. New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1961.

_____. Lectures on Romans. Translated by Wilhelm Pauck. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

McClure, Norman Egbert, (ed.). The Letters of John Chamberlain. 2 vols. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1939.

McIlwain, C.H., (ed.). Political Works of James I. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1918.

The Manuscripts of the Earl of Lonsdale. ("Historical Manuscripts Commission," Series 33, 13th Report, Appendix, Part VII.) London: HM Stationery Office, 1893.

Maynwaring, Roger. Religion and Allegiance. London, 1627.

Molhuysen, P.C., (ed.). Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius. 2 vols. Gravehage: M. Nijhoff, 1928.

Montague, Richard. Appello Caesarem: A Just Appeale From Two Unjust Informers. London, 1625.

_____. A Gagg for the New Gospel? No: A New Gagg For An Old Goose. London, 1624.

Nichols, John, (ed.). The Progresses, Processions and Magnificent Festivities of James I. 4 vols. London: J.B. Nichols, 1828.

Overall, John. Articles of Controversy in the Low Countries, Translated by William Goode in The Doctrine of the Church of Englande As to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants, pp. 127-33. 2nd edition. London: L. Hatchard and Sons, 1850.

_____. "To the Most High and Mighty Prince James...," Dedication to the Collected works of John Jewel, in folios of 1609 and 1611. Appendix, The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury. Edited by John Ayre. Vol. IV. Cambridge: University Press, 1850.

Parker, Matthew. Correspondence of Matthew Parker. Edited by John Bruce. Cambridge: University Press, 1853.

Peel, Albert and Carlson, L.H., (eds.). Cartwrightiana. London: Allen and Unwin, 1951.

Perkins, William. Golden Chaine, Or The Description of Theologie, Containing the Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, According to God's Word. London, 1591, 1597.

_____. The Workes of That Famous and Worthy Minister of Christ in the Universitee of Cambridge, Mr. William Perkins. 3 vols. London, 1609-1617.

Petrie, Sir Charles, (ed.). The Letters, Speeches and Proclamations of King Charles I. London: Cassell and Co., 1935.

Plaifere, John. Appello Evangelium For the Doctrine of the Divine Predestination Concorded With the Orthodox Doctrines of Gods Free Grace, and Mans Free-Will. London, 1651.

Playfere, Thomas. The Whole Sermons of That Eloquent Divine Thomas Playfere, Doctor in Divinity. London, 1633.

Prynne, William. Anti-Arminianisme, Or the Church of England's Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme, etc. London, 1630.

_____. A Breviate of the Life of William Laud Archbishop of Canterbury: Extracted (For the Most Part) Verbatim, out of His Owne Diary, and Other Writings, Under His Owne Hand. London, 1644.

_____. A Brief Survey and Censure of Mr. Cozens His Couzening Devotions. London, 1628.

_____. The Church of Englands Old Antithesis To New Arminianisme. London, 1629.

_____. God, No Impostor, Nor Deluder. London, 1629.

_____. The Perpetuitie of A Regenerate Mans Estate. London, 1626.

R. I (J.) (Rhodes, John?). The Spy Discovering the Danger of Arminian Heresie and Spanish Trecherie. Strassburgh (London?), 1628.

Robrinson, John. A Defence of the Doctrine Propounded By the Synode At Dort. London, 1624.

Rous, Francis. Testis Veritatis, The Doctrine of King James Our Late Soveraigne of Famous Memory. London, 1626.

Rushworth, John. Historical Collections Of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in Law, Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments. Vol. I. London: Thomas Newcomb, 1659-1722.

Salvetti Correspondence, appended to The Manuscripts of Henry Duncan Skrine, Esq. ("Historical Manuscripts Commission, Series 16, 11th Report, Part I. London: HM Stationery Office, 1887.

Scott, Thomas, (ed.). The Articles of the Synod of Dort and Its Rejection of Errors: With the History of Events Which Made Way For That Synod. Utica: William Williams Press, 1831.

Schaff, Philip. Bibliotheca Symbolica Ecclesiae Universalis: The Creeds of Christendom, With a History and Critical Notes. 3 vols. 4th revised edition. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1919.

Sibthorpe, Robert. Apostolike Obedience Shewing the Duty of Subjects To Pay Tribute and Taxes to Their Princes. London, 1627.

Story, G.M., (ed.). Lancelot Andrewes: Sermons. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Underhill, Edward Bean, (ed.). Tracts on Liberty of Conscience and Persecution 1614-61. ("Hanserd Knollys Society,") London: J. Haddon, 1846.

Usher, James. The Whole Works of...J. Usher. Edited by C.R. Elrington and J.M. Todd. 17 vols. Dublin, 1847-64.

Waller, Edmund. Pooms. 9th edition. London: Jacob Tonson, 1712.

Ward, Samuel. A Collection of Such Sermons and Treatises As Have Been Written and Published By Mr. Samuel Ward, Preacher of Ipswich. London, 1627.

Warwick, Philip. Memoires Of the Reigne of Charles I. 3rd edition. London, 1703.

White, Francis. The Orthodox Faith and Way To the Church Explaned and Justified. London, 1617, 1624.

_____. A Replie to Jesuit Fishers Answere To Certain Questions Propounded by His Most Gratious Majestie, King James. London, 1624.

Whitgift, John. The Works of John Whitgift D.D., Master of Trinity College, Dean of Lincoln, Etc. Edited by John Ayre. 3 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1851-53.

Wilkins, D., (ed.). Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae. Vol. IV. London, 1737.

Winwood, Ralph. Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. 3 vols. London, 1725.

Wotton, Anthony. A Dangerous Plot Discovered By a Discourse Wherein It Is Proved That Mr. Richard Montague, In His Two Books, The One Called "New Gagg," the Other "A Just Appeal," Laboureth to Bring In the Faith of Rome and Arminius Under the Name and Pretence of the Doctrine of Faith of the Church of England. London, 1626.

_____. A Defence of M. Perkins Booke, Called A Reformed Catholike. London, 1605.

Yates, J. Gods Arraignment of Hypocrites With An Inlargement Concerning Gods Decree in Ordering Sinne As Likewise a Defense of M. Calvine Against Bellarmine and of M. Perkins Against Arminius. London, 1615.

_____. Ibis Ad Caesarem. Or a Submissive Appearance Before Caesar; In Answer to Mr. Mountague's Appeale, In the Points of Arminianisme and Popery, Maintained By Him... London, 1626.

Zwingli, Ulrich. Hauptschriften. Translated by Fritz Blanke, Oskar Farner, and Rudolf Pfister. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1940-63.

_____. Huldreich Zwinglis Samtliche Werke. Edited by Emil Egli and Georg Finsler. 11 vols. (Corpus Reformation, Vols. LXXXVIII-XCVIII.) Berlin: C.A. Schwetschke and Son, 1901-05.

_____. The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli. Edited by William John Hinke. 2 vols. Philadelphia: The Heidelberg Press, 1922.

Secondary Sources

Achbold, W.A.J. "A Diary of the Parliament of 1626," English Historical Review, XVII (October, 1902) 730-37.

Allen, John W. English Political Thought, 1603-1660. 2 vols. London: Methuen and Co., 1938.

Babbage, Stuart B. Puritanism and Richard Bancroft. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1962.

Babington, John A. The Reformation. London: John Murray Co., 1901.

Baird, Henry Martyn. Theodore Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation, 1519-1605. New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1899.

Bangs, Carl. "Arminius and the Reformation," Church History, XXX (June, 1961), 155-70.

———. "Arminius and Reformed Theology." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

Bavinck, Herman. The Doctrine of God. Translated by W. Hendriksen. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951.

Bense, Johan. The Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third. 's Gravenhage, Nijhoff, 1924.

Berkhof, Louis. The History of Christian Doctrines. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.

Bicknell, Edward John. A Theological Introduction to the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England. London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1944.

Brook, Victor John Knight. Whitgift and the English Church. London: The English University Press, 1957.

Bourne, Edward C.E. The Anglicanism of William Laud. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1947.

Brandt, Gerhard. Historie der Reformatie. Translated by Chamberlayne. 4 vols. London: Printed by T. Wood for John Nicks, 1720-23.

Brett, S. Reed. John Pym, 1583-1643. London: John Murray Co., 1940.

Breward, I. "The Life and Theology of William Perkins, 1558-1602." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manchester, 1963.

Buis, Henry. Historic Protestantism and Predestination. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1958.

Campbell, Douglas. The Puritan in Holland, England and America; an Introduction to American History. London: Harper and Brothers, 1892.

Chadwick, Owen. "Arminianism in England," Religion in Life, XXIX (Autumn, 1960) 548-55.

Clarke, F. Stuart. "The Theology of Arminius," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLXXXV (October, 1960), 248-53.

Colie, Rosalie Littell. Light and Enlightenment: A Study of the Cambridge Platonists and the Dutch Arminians. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

Collier, Jeremy. Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain. Edited by Thomas Lathbury. 9 vols. London: Printed for William Straker, 1852.

Collins, William Edward, (ed.). Typical English Churchmen from Parker to Maurice. 2 vols. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1902.

Costin, William C. The History of St. John's College, Oxford, 1598-1860. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Curtis, Mark. "Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath," History, XLVI, No. 156 (February, 1961) 1-17.

_____. Oxford and Cambridge in Transition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Curtiss, George L. Arminianism in History, or The Revolt from Predestination. Cincinnati: Cranston and Curts, 1894.

Davies, Ebenezer Thomas. Episcopacy and The Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the 16th Century. Oxford: Blackwell, 1950.

Davies, Godfrey. "Arminian versus Puritan in England, ca. 1620-1640," Huntington Library Bulletin, No. 5 (April, 1934), pp. 157-179.

_____. Bibliography of British History, Stuart Period, 1603-1714. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928.

_____. "English Political Sermons, 1603-1640," Huntingdon Library Quarterly, 3. No.1 (October, 1939), pp. 1-22.

_____. The Early Stuarts 1603-1660. (The Oxford History of England. Edited by G.N. Clark, Vol. IX.) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Dawley, Powell Mills. John Whitgift and the English Reformation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.

De La Roche, Michael. An Abridgment of Gerard Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low-Countries. 2 vols. London, 1725.

The Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sidney Lee and Leslie Stephen. 22 vols. with decennial supplements. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1885-1901.

Dillingham, William. Life of Lawrence Chaderton. Translated by E.S. Shuckburgh. Cambridge: MacMillan and Bowes, 1884.

Dixon, Richard W. History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction. 6 vols. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1884-1903.

Dowden, Edward. Puritan and Anglican. London: Paul Toubner and Co., 1900.

Edmundson, George. Anglo-Dutch Rivalry during the First Half of the 17th Century. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

Eusden, John D. Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics in Early Seventeenth Century England. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

Evan, John. King Charles I. London: Arthur Baker Ltd., 1933.

Fisher, George P. The Reformation. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1896.

Forster, John. Sir John Eliot: A Biography 1592-1632. 2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall, 1872.

Foster, H.D. "Liberal Calvinism: The Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort," Harvard Theological Review, XVI, No. 1 (January, 1923), 1-37.

Frere, W.H. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I 1558-1625. (A History of the English Church, Vol. V.) London and New York: MacMillan and Co., 1904.

Fryer, W.R. "The High Churchmen of the Earlier Seventeenth Century," Renaissance and Modern Studies, V (1961), 106-149.

Fuller, Morris. The Life, Letters and Writings of John Davenant, D.D. 1572-1641, Lord Bishop of Salisbury. London: Methuen and Co., 1897.

Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain From the Birth of Jesus Christ Until the Year 1648. Edited by J.S. Brewer. 6 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1845.

_____. The History of the University of Cambridge From the Conquest to the Year 1634. Edited by Marmaduke Priskett and Thomas Wright. Cambridge: J. and J.J. Deighton and T. Stevenson, 1840.

Gardiner, Samuel R. The History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. 10 vols. London: Longman, Green and Co., 1884-86.

_____. The Personal Government of Charles I, A History of England from the Assassination of the Duke of Buckingham to the Declaration of the Judges on Ship-Money 1628-1637. 2 vols. London: Longman, Green and Co., 1877.

_____. Prince Charles and The Spanish Marriage, 1617-1623. 2 vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1869.

George, Charles H. and Katherine. The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation 1570-1640. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Geyl, Peter. The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century. 2 vols. London: E. Benn, 1961-64.

Gibson, Edgar Charles Sumner, (ed.). The Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England. London: Methuen and Co., 1902.

Glucker, J. "Richard Thomson to Isaac Casaubon, 1596," Biblotheque d'Humanisme et Renaissance, No. 1 (1968), pp. 149-155.

Goode, William. The Doctrine of the Church of England As to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants. London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1850.

Green, Vivian Hubert Howard. Religion at Oxford and Cambridge. London: S.C.M. Press, 1964.

Hacket, John. Scrinia reserata: A Memorial Offered to the Great Deservings of John Williamss D.D., ...Containing a Series of the Most Remarkable Occurrences and Transactions of His Life. 2 parts in 1 vol. London: 1693.

Hallam, Henry. The Constitutional History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II. 3 vols. London: John Murray, 1855.

Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism, 1570-1643. New York: College University Press, 1938.

Hardwick, Charles. A History of the Articles of Religion. London: George Bell and Sons, 1890.

Hargrave, O.T. "The Doctrine of Predestination in the English Reformation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966.

_____. "The Freewillers in the English Reformation," Church History, XXXVII (September, 1968), No. 3, 271-280.

Harris, William. An Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of Charles I King of Great Britain After the manner of Mr. Bayle, Drawn from Original Writers and State Papers. London: Printed for W. Strahan, T. Becket and Co., and J. Cadell, 1772.

Harrison, Archibald W. Arminianism. London: Duckworth, 1937.

_____. The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort. London: University of London Press, 1926.

_____. "The Church of England's Reaction from Calvinism in the Seventeenth Century," Religion in Life, XIII (Spring, 1944), 213-23.

Henson, Herbert Hensley. The Relation of the Church of England to the other Reformed Churches. Edinburgh & London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1911.

Heylyn, Peter. Aerius Redivivus: Or, The History of the Presbyterians, ed. Henry Heylyn. London, 1670-72.

_____. Cyprianus Anglicus: Or, The History of /Laud/. London, 1671.

_____. Ecclesia Restaurata: Or, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. Edited by James Craigie Robertson. 2 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1849.

_____. Ecclesia Vindicata: Or, The Church of England Justified. London, 1657.

_____. Historia Quinquarticularis: Or, A Declaration of the Judgment of the Western Churches, and more particularly of the Church of England, in the Five Controverted Points, reproached in these last times by the name of Arminianism. London, 1660.

Hickman, Henry. Historia Quinq-Articularis Exarticulata. London, 1673.

Hicks, Leo. "The ecclesiastical supremacy of Queen Elizabeth," The Month, CLXXXIII (1947), 170-77.

Higham, Florence May Grier. Lancelet Andrewes. London: S.C.M. Press, 1952.

Hoenderdaal, Gerrit Jan. "The Life and Thought of Jacobus Arminius," Religion in Life, XXIX, No. 4 (Autumn, 1960), 540-47.

Hopf, Constantin, (ed.). "A Letter of Martin Bucer," Journal of Theological Studies, XLIV (1943), 67-72.

_____. Martin Bucer and the English Reformation. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1946.

Hughes, Philip. The Reformation in England: "True Religion Now Established." 3 vols. London: Hollis and Carter, 1951-54.

Hulme, Harold. The Life of Sir John Eliot 1592 to 1632: Struggle for Parliamentary Freedom. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1957.

Hunt, John. Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of the Last Century. London: Strahan and Co., 1870-73.

Hutton, William H. The English Church From the Accession of Charles I to the Death of Anne (1625-1714). London: MacMillan and Co., 1903.

Jordan, Wilbur Kitchener. The Development of Religious Toleration in England 1603-1640. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932-38.

Kautz, Arthur D. "The Jacobean Episcopate and Its Legacy." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1952.

Kennedy, D.E. "The Jacobean Episcopate," Historical Journal, V (1962), 175-181.

Knappen, Marshall M. Tudor Puritanism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Knight, William Stanley MacBean. The Life and Works of Hugo Grotius. (Grotius Society Publications, no. 4.) London, 1925.

Lamb, John. An Historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles From the First Promulgation of Them in 1553 to Their Final Establishment in 1571. Cambridge: University Press, 1829.

Lee, Robert Warden. Hugo Grotius. (Proceedings of the British Academy.) London, 1931.

McCulloh, Gerald O. (ed.). Man's Faith in Freedom: The Theological Influence of Jacobus Arminius. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

McLachlan, Herbert J. Socinianism in Seventeenth Century England. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.

McNeil, John J. The History and Character of Calvinism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

MacLure, Millar. The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Marah, William Hennessy. Memoirs of Archbishop Juxon and his Times. Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1869.

Martin, A.S. "Predestination," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, X (1919), 225-35.

Moir, Thomas. The Addled Parliament of 1614. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Morgan, Irvonwy. Prince Charles' Puritan Chaplain. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1957.

Mosheim, John Lawrence. An Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern. 6 vols. Charlestown: Samuel Etheridge, 1811.

Mosse, George L. The Holy Pretense: A Study of Christianity and Reason of State from Perkins to Winthrop. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957.

Motley, John Lothrop. The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland, with a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of The Thirty Years War. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1874.

Mozley, James B. A Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination. London: J. Murray Co., 1883.

_____. Essays Historical and Theological. 2 vols. London, 1878.

Mullinger, James Baas. Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century. London and Cambridge: University Press, 1867.

_____. The University of Cambridge. 3 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1873-1911.

Neale, John Ernest. The Elizabethan House of Commons. London: Jonathan Cape, 1949.

Neander, Johann August Wilhelm. Lectures on the History of Christian Dogmas. Translated by J.E. Ryland. 2 vols. London: George Bellard and Sons, 1888.

Neve, J.L. "Arminianism in Its Influence Upon England," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXXVIII (1931), 145-65.

New, John F.H. Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition 1558-1640. Stanford: University Press, 1964.

Nichols, James. Calvinism and Arminianism Compared in their Principles and Tendencies. 2 vols. London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown and Green, 1824.

Nobbs, Douglas. Theocracy and Toleration: A Study of the Disputes in Dutch Calvinism from 1600-1650. Cambridge: University Press, 1938.

Notestein, Wallace. Four Worthies. London: Alden Press, 1956.

Ottley, Robert Lawrence. Lancelot Andrewes. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1894.

Pamp, F.E. "Studies in the Origins of English Arminianism." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951.

Pattison, Mark. Isaac Casaubon 1559-1614. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1875.

Pawson, Geoffrey Philip. The Cambridge Platonists and Their Place in Religious Thought. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1930.

Platt, Frederick. "Arminianism," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, I (1926) 807-16.

Porter, Harry Culverwell. Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.

_____. "The Anglicanism of Archbishop Whitgift," Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, XXXI (June, 1962) No. a, 127-143.

Powicke, Frederick James. The Cambridge Platonists. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Rattenbury, H. Morley. "The Historical Background and Life of Arminius," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLXXXV (October, 1960), 243-48.

Reidy, Maurice Francis. Bishop Lancelot Andrewes. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1955.

Russell, Arthur T. Memoirs of the Life and Works of Lancelot Andrewes, D.D.,... London: Saunders, Otley, and Co., 1863.

Sargeant, W.D. "The Lambeth Articles," The Journal of Theological Studies, XII (January, 1911), 251-260; (April, 1911), 427-436.

Soden, Geoffrey Ingle. Godfrey Goodman Bishop of Gloucester 1583-1656. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1953.

Strype, John. Annals of the Reformation under Elizabeth. 4 vols. in 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824.

_____. The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D.D., the Third and Last Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822.

Sykes, Norman. The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: An Essay Towards an Historical Interpretation of the Anglican Tradition from Whitgift to Wake. (Theology, Occasional Papers, New Series, no. 11.) London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1948.

_____. Old Priest and New Presbyter: Episcopacy and Presbyterianism Since the Reformation with Especial Relation to the Churches of England and Scotland. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.

Tanner, Joseph R. English Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century, 1603-1689. Cambridge: University Press, 1928.

Thompson, James Vincent Perronet. Supreme Governor: Ecclesiastical Policy and Circumstance. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1940.

Trevor-Roper, H.R. Archbishop Laud 1573-1645. London: MacMillan and Co., 1940.

Tulloch, James. Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the Seventeenth Century. 2 vols. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1872.

Usher, Roland G. The Reconstruction of the English Church. 2 vols. London and New York: D Appleton and Co., 1910.

Van Itterzoon, G.P. "Koning Jacobus I en de Synode van Dordrecht," Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, XXIV (1931), 187-204.

Venn, John and Venn, J.A. (eds.). Alumni Cantabrigienses 4 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1922-27.

_____. The Book of Matriculations and Degrees...in the University of Cambridge from 1544 to 1659. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.

Vreeland, Hamilton. Hugo Grotius. New York: Oxford University Press, 1917.

Wakefield, G.D. "Arminianism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," London Quarterly and Holborn Review, CLXXXV (October, 1960), 253-58.

Warfield, Benjamin B. Calvin and Augustine. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1956.

_____. "Predestination in the Reformed Confessions," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, XII (1901), 49-128.

Welsby, Paul A. George Abbott, the Unwanted Archbishop 1562-1633. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1962.

_____. Lancelot Andrewes 1555-1626. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1958.

_____. "Lancelet Andrewes and the Nature of Kingship," Church Quarterly Review, CLVI (October, 1955), 400-408.

Williams, Alwyn T.P. The Anglican Tradition in the Life of England. London: S.C.M. Press, 1947.

Willson, David Harris. King James VI and I. London: Jonathan Cape, 1956.

Wingfield-Stratford, Esme. Charles, King of England 1603-1637. London: Hollis and Carter, 1949.

Wood, Anthony A. Athenae Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops who have had Their Education in the University of Oxford from 1500-1695. Edited by Philip Bliss. 4 vols. London: Printed for F.S. and J. Rivington, 1813-20.

_____. The History and Antiquities of University of Oxford. Edited by John Gutch. 2 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1792-96.

Woodhouse, Hugh Frederic. The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology 1547-1603. London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1954.

Wormuth, Francis Dunham. The Royal Prerogative 1603-1649. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1939.